

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
CABINET
4 July 2012**

REPORT TITLE: Residents' Parking Scheme update

Ward(s) affected by this report: Citywide

Strategic Director: Graham Sims, Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods & City Development

Report author: Peter Mann, Service Director, Transport

Contact telephone no. (0117) 922 2947
e-mail address: peter.mann@bristol.gov.uk

Report signed off by executive member: Cllr Tim Kent

Purpose of the report:

This report summarises the response to the statutory advertisement of the Cotham Residents' Parking Scheme (RPS) proposals and sets out the process for developing additional RPS areas.

RECOMMENDATION for Cabinet approval:

1. To authorise the sealing of the City Council of Bristol (Cotham Area, Cabot and Cotham, City of Bristol) (North, North Central, North West and West Central Zones) (Residents' Parking Area) (Prohibition of Stopping) Order 20—subject to the modifications proposed in Appendix 2.
2. To agree that the decisions regarding the proposed Residents' Parking Scheme areas in Redcliffe, St Pauls and Easton/St Philip's will be taken under delegated authority by the Service Director for Transport in consultation with the Executive Member for Budget and Transport.
3. To agree the engagement process regarding the development of schemes in other areas.

The Proposal:

Cotham Residents' Parking Scheme proposals

1. In July 2011, the Cabinet agreed to engage with local communities and their Neighbourhood Partnerships to seek their views regarding the development of potential residents' parking schemes in four areas of Bristol. This followed the review of Bristol's first Residents' Parking Scheme, which was introduced in Kingsdown in January 2010.
2. The Kingsdown scheme was successful in achieving its aims. In a review carried out in June 2011, residents identified the following benefits:
 - Greater community cohesion as residents are less stressed and are more communicative with one another;

- Improved quality of life as residents find it much easier to use their car when they need to without worrying about being able to park it again afterwards;
 - The streets are quieter and safer now that vehicles are not circling the area searching for a parking space, particularly early in the mornings;
 - It is easier and safer for pedestrians to walk around the neighbourhood;
 - Access to properties has improved, which has benefited people with limited mobility and will ensure access for emergency vehicles and deliveries is as easy as possible;
 - The introduction of pay & display has improved access to local amenities, particularly as parking is free for the first 15 minutes.
3. The areas identified for the development of similar proposals were Cotham, Redcliffe, St Pauls and Easton/St Philip's.
 4. Following this decision, the Council engaged with the Cotham Forum and the Cotham, Redland and Bishopston Neighbourhood Partnership to develop proposals for a potential scheme. Both groups agreed that it would be appropriate to carry out an informal consultation to seek the views of local residents and businesses on a potential scheme. A small part of the proposed scheme area is within the Cabot, Clifton and Clifton East Neighbourhood Partnership area, so the consultation process was also discussed with local ward members and at the appropriate Forum.
 5. The Council carried out a non-statutory consultation process with local residents and businesses from 24th October to 2nd December 2011. Information was sent to 2,556 properties in the area, outlining the proposals and inviting comments on the initial designs and operating principles. Two consultation events were held at Cheltenham Road Library during November, which provided the opportunity for local residents and business owners to discuss the proposals with officers in detail. Officers also met with the Hampton Park and Cotham Hill Community Group and the Redland and Cotham Amenities Society.
 6. Every household and business were sent a survey asking people to give their views on the scheme in general, the detailed designs and the proposed operating principles. We received 598 responses, which equates to a response rate of 23%.
 7. Most of the respondents were happy with the scheme proposals as set out; of those requesting changes, many of these referred to local issues such as the relative amounts of pay & display and permit only parking bay provision. There were also some requests for greater flexibility for businesses located within the proposed scheme area.
 8. As a result of this consultation, a number of minor changes were made to the detailed design of the proposed scheme, in order to accommodate local people's requests wherever possible. There were also a number of requests to remove proposed double yellow lines from driveways and other accesses. We sought to accommodate these wherever possible and have achieved this in the majority of cases.
 9. We have also made some improvements to the proposed operating principles of the scheme, in order to provide greater flexibility for residents and businesses. These are as follows:

- Each household located within the scheme area will be able to apply for up to three permits. Previously, the third permit was only to be issued in exceptional circumstances. The numbers of third permits issued will be reviewed annually and renewals will be dependent on the parking capacity within the area.
- Each business located within the scheme area will be able to apply for up to two business permits irrespective of whether they have off-street parking. The first permit will cost £100 per year and the second £200 per year.
- Local businesses can apply for customer permits if they require customers to park their vehicles within the scheme area. Eligible businesses will be able to purchase up to five of these at a cost of £100 each per year.
- Landlords who own properties in the area will be able to apply for one business permit for every ten properties that they own, up to a maximum of ten permits. These will cost £100 each per year.

10. The final proposals were subject to a statutory advertisement process, which took place from 9 May to 1 June 2012. 188 objections were received in response to this. The objections are summarised and responded to in Appendix 1. Of these, approximately one third were from commuters who work in the area, one fifth were from people who live just outside the area and have concerns about displaced parking and one fifth made suggestions or requests for amendments to the design for their street. In addition, some requests for minor amendments were received outside the statutory process. These have all been considered and the requests accommodated wherever possible.
11. The Traffic Orders Procedure Regulations allow authorities to modify an order, whether in consequence of any objections or otherwise, before it is made. Where modification appears to make a 'substantial change' to an order, the authority shall take appropriate steps to: (a) inform persons likely to be affected by the modifications; (b) give those persons an opportunity to make representations; and (c) ensure that due consideration is given to any such representations.
12. In deciding whether a 'substantial change' is being proposed, the test adopted by the Council is whether someone might have been minded to object to the proposed modification if it had been included in the order when originally advertised. Officers consider it unlikely that anyone would wish to object to the suggested modification and, therefore, that further consultation is not necessary.
13. Approval is sought to implement the Cotham Residents' Parking Scheme with modifications as listed in Appendix 2.

Decision-making process for Redcliffe, St Pauls and Easton/St. Philip's proposals

14. As set out in paragraph 1, the Cotham area is the first of four areas for which residents' parking scheme proposals are currently being developed. Proposals for the other areas (Redcliffe, St Pauls and Easton/St Philip's) are at various stages of development. If they reach the statutory advertisement stage, it is anticipated that this will take place during the second half of 2012.
15. Approval is sought to enable the decision on whether or not to implement these schemes to be made under delegated authority by the Service Director for Transport in consultation with the Executive Member for Budget and Transport. No decision will be made until a thorough consultation approach has been followed in terms of engaging with the community and local ward members.

Development of future schemes

16. In early 2011, officers carried out an initial assessment of potential RPS areas close to the city centre. This considered issues such as the impact of unnecessary commuter traffic on the road network, indications of support drawn from the outcome of previous consultation as well as more recently expressed support and the overall benefit that a scheme could bring to the area.
17. Since this assessment was carried out, residents of other areas have continued to request that we consider developing a scheme for their neighbourhood and other driving factors have come to the fore.
18. There are a number of issues that are likely to generate requests for additional scheme areas to be considered, including:
 - a. The impact of other transport projects, particularly Bus Rapid Transit.
 - b. The impact of the Enterprise Zone.
 - c. Proximity to other parking schemes (the Controlled Parking Zone or an RPS area)
 - d. New development proposals that may impact on parking anywhere in the city.
19. Approval is sought to engage with local residents and businesses based in other areas regarding the potential development of schemes for their neighbourhood. Local areas that are adjacent to any residents' parking schemes that are delivered will be consulted to seek their views on parking in their area within a year of implementation of the scheme. If the schemes that are currently under development were delivered, this would necessitate consultation with the part of Cotham not included in this scheme, Redland, Montpelier and part of Clifton.
20. Other key components that would determine the areas to be considered are the pressing need arising from existing commuter parking problems and the impact of other developments as set out in paragraph 16. On this basis, proposals for Spike Island and Bower Ashton will be developed. Southville and the north east part of Bedminster have also been identified as local areas where it may be appropriate to consider the development of residents' parking scheme proposals.
21. If proposals are to be developed for any of these areas, officers will work closely with local ward members, residents, businesses and the relevant Forum and/or Neighbourhood Partnership throughout the process.

Consultation and Scrutiny Input:

- a. **Internal consultation:**
Highways and Traffic, Parking Services, City Transport, City Design
- b. **External consultation:**
Local residents, businesses and organisations located within the proposed Cotham Residents' Parking scheme area.
Ward members for Cotham and Cabot wards.
Hampton Park and Cotham Hill Community Group
Redland and Cotham Amenities Society

Other Options considered:

‘Do nothing’ – if the Cotham scheme is not implemented, existing parking problems, access issues and road safety issues will remain and are likely to worsen. Therefore, this is not considered to be a viable option.

Another option considered is to implement a conventional waiting restrictions scheme. This may solve some of the access issues but it would also have the effect of giving no parking priority to local residents and businesses whilst increasing pressure on the remaining parking capacity. A separate funding stream would also have to be identified.

Risk management / assessment:

FIGURE 1							
The risks associated with the implementation of the (subject) decision :							
No.	RISK Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report	INHERENT RISK (Before controls)		RISK CONTROL MEASURES Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation).	CURRENT RISK (After controls)		RISK OWNER
		Impact	Probability		Impact	Probability	
1	The scheme does not meet people’s needs	Medium	Low	A thorough consultation process has been conducted prior to developing the final proposal, which has ensured that the scheme has been shaped to meet the needs of the community. If the scheme does provide as many benefits as anticipated once it has been implemented, these issues will be addressed in the review which is scheduled to take place during the first six months of operation. This will enable changes to be made to ensure that the scheme better meets people’s needs.	Low	Low	
2	The scheme has an adverse impact on the viability of local businesses	High	Low	The scheme is intended to increase access to local businesses so it should benefit them. Consultation with local businesses has been carried out during the development of the proposals to ensure that the needs of businesses are taken into account. If there are any issues arising once the scheme has been implemented, these will be addressed as part of the six months review of the scheme.	Medium	Low	
3	The signs, lines and pay & display machines are visually intrusive	Medium	Medium	The scheme will be implemented as sympathetically as possible to the standards associated with the conservation area.	Low	Low	
4	Commuter parking is displaced to other areas	Medium	Medium	The impact on surrounding areas will be monitored once the scheme is introduced. The council is committed to consulting these areas after the scheme has been implemented.	Low	Medium	

FIGURE 2

The risks associated with not implementing the (subject) decision:

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report	INHERENT RISK		RISK CONTROL MEASURES Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation).	CURRENT RISK		RISK OWNER
		(Before controls)			(After controls)		
		Impact	Probability		Impact	Probability	
1	Continued and worsening local parking problems	High	High	Implement the recommendations in this report	High	Medium	
2	Continued and worsening emergency access issues	High	High	Implement the recommendations in this report	High	Low	
3	Continued and worsening road safety, obstruction and visibility issues	High	Medium	Implement the recommendations in this report	High	Low	
4	Network congestion through dependency on the private car for commuting purposes	Medium	High	Implement the recommendations in this report	Medium	Medium	
5	Reduced ability to encourage use of more sustainable travel options, ie public transport, walking and cycling, in line with the objectives of the Joint Local Transport Plan.	Medium	High	Implement the recommendations in this report	Medium	Medium	
6	Missed opportunity to reduce street clutter.	Low	High	Implement the recommendations in this report	Low	Low	

Public sector equality duties:

Before making a decision, section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following “protected characteristics”: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:

i) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.

ii) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

- remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic.

- take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it (in relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities);

- encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

iii) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

The screening assessment of the Kingsdown Residents' Parking Scheme (RPS) found that there were positive implications for older people and people with disabilities, as the scheme improves access by making it easier to park in the area. No significant implications were identified for the other equalities communities.

The Cotham Residents' Parking Scheme proposals do not constitute a new scheme or policy, as they mirror the scheme introduced in the adjacent area of Kingsdown. However, these proposals have been fully considered in their own right. This work has found that the introduction of a scheme in Cotham does not present any new implications.

Environmental checklist / eco impact assessment

The aim of this scheme is to remove commuter parking from local areas. This will reduce levels of parking in the area and aims to contribute towards a modal shift away from the private car.

In the short term it will be difficult to quantify the extent of the positive environmental impacts generated by the residents' parking scheme, as it will be difficult to measure the numbers of commuters who choose modal shift away from the private car compared to those who choose to park in neighbouring residential areas.

However, in the longer term we anticipate that significant positive impacts could be achieved in terms of reduced localised congestion, reduced CO₂ emissions and pollutants detrimental to local air quality, as measures to discourage commuter parking increase. These measures include the improvements to other modes as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan, improvements made as part of other initiatives such as Cycling City and the potential to introduce measures to deal with commuter parking in neighbouring areas should residents request this.

Negative impacts are related to the delivery of the scheme, particularly in respect of the consumption of raw materials for signage, lines & parking equipment, the potential impacts on drainage and wildlife & habitats if residents convert their front gardens into private off street parking and changes to the appearance of the local area.

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts

- The Council will purchase solar powered pay & display machines.
- Signs and lines will be installed as sympathetically as possible within the legal requirements for the scheme and the installation process will be an opportunity to reduce street clutter.
- The scheme will protect junctions, pavements and narrow streets from inappropriate parking, as well as reducing overall levels of parking in the area. This will improve the appearance of the area.
- The risk of creation of additional off-street parking and subsequent impacts on biodiversity & surface run off will be controlled through the Council's planning process (& follow up enforcement actions).

The net effects of the proposals are positive.

Resource and legal implications:

a. Financial (revenue) implications:

The scheme is expected to be self-financing with the income generated by the scheme primarily used to maintain and administer it. Any surplus income generated will be used to deliver the Transport priorities as detailed in the West of England Joint Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2026

Advice given by Chris Williams, Finance Team Manager, Neighbourhoods & City Development

Date 23 May 2012

b. Financial (capital) implications:

A project budget of £400k been allocated from the £1.5m approved for Residents Parking Scheme in the 2012/13 Capital Programme.

Advice given by Chris Williams, Finance Team Manager, Neighbourhoods & City Development

Date 23 May 2012

c. Legal implications:

It is imperative that the outcomes of future statutory consultation in respect of proposed scheme areas yet to be advertised are not pre-determined. With regards the proposed Cotham scheme - the responsibility of the Cabinet is to consider the facts and arguments set out in the report and weigh and balance the arguments in order to reach a lawful and reasonable decision. The Cabinet must consider the statutory basis of the decision and in doing that consider carefully the results of the statutory consultation.

The Council, as local traffic and highway authority for its area, has a key role to play in delivering the policies and objectives of the Joint Local Transport Plan. In devising a residents' parking scheme, the Council must exercise its powers taking into account lawful considerations with the aim of traffic management policy. In this context, the Council also needs to be mindful of its network management duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004. Briefly, this duty obliges local traffic authorities to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable (having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives) to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on its road network. This can include the more efficient use of the road network or the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion or other disruption to the movement of traffic on their road network. This may involve the exercise of any power to regulate or coordinate the uses made of any road in the road. This has an obvious relevance in connection with residents' parking schemes.

It should also be noted that when deciding on how to exercise its powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, it must exercise such functions (so far as practicable) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. This ties in with the other policy issues referred to the report. Factors to take in account include: the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises; the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run; any national air quality strategy; the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant. Any parking scheme promoted must be justifiable in transport-related terms with the aim of being self-financing in terms of charges which are set for permits and other matters.

The promotion of an order under the 1984 Act must be in accordance with the prescribed statutory procedures, namely: the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. These procedures involve advertisement of the proposals and invitation of objections. The Council is under a legal duty to consider any objections received in response to the statutory consultation

process before the relevant decision-maker can make any decision. The objections are summarized and addressed in Appendix 1 to this report.

Apart for the authorizing the sealing of the draft order or abandonment of the proposed scheme, other options include making modifications to the scheme such as those referred to in Appendix 2 to this report. However, if this option were to be pursued - further consultation might need to be undertaken regarding any proposed modifications. Such modifications can be in consequence of any statutory objections (or otherwise) before an order is made. Where modifications appear to the authority to make a 'substantial change' to the order, the authority shall take appropriate steps to inform persons likely to be affected, give those persons an opportunity to make and ensure that any such representations are duly considered by the authority.

It will be a matter for the authority's reasonable judgement to decide what is a 'substantial change'. The test which the Council has adopted in relation to other proposed schemes has been to consider whether someone might be minded to object to the proposed modification if the order as originally advertised had contained the modification. This will be a question for Officers to decide in each case particularly as to whether it is likely that anyone who did not object originally would have objected to the revised proposals, then that will constitute a 'substantial change'. Having said this, if an objection can be overcome entirely without losing scheme benefits - then the scheme can be recommended to go ahead with the amendments. Paragraphs 10 and 11 of this report deals with this.

Advice given by Peter Malarby, Senior Solicitor (Highways & Transport)
Date 22 June 2012

d. Land / property implications:

There are no land or property implications contained in this report.

Advice given by Ian Smith, Corporate Property
Date 24 May 2012

e. Human resources implications:

There are no HR implications contained in this report.

Advice given by Chris Dagger, HR Business Partner
Date 24 May 2012

Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Objections to proposed Traffic Regulation Order regarding the Cotham Residents' Parking Scheme proposals

Appendix 2 – List of minor amendments to the Cotham Residents' Parking Scheme

Access to information (background papers):

APPENDIX 1

Cotham Residents' Parking Scheme - Objections to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders (ref: CAE/PM/P/789).

OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICERS' RESPONSE
<p>1. Resident of 59 Dongola Road Bishopston BS7 9HW</p>	<p>Usually parks around Trelawney Road on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays after taking children to their nursery on Archfield Road. Not objecting due to personal circumstance but on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Parking problems are seasonal; it is easy to park outside school and university term times. The Council should be engaging with schools and universities rather than introducing residents' parking.</p> <p>2. Residents' parking schemes are unfair for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) Many other areas have parking problems, eg around Gloucester Road, but they have no prospect of a residents' parking scheme.</p> <p>b) There are no reasonable alternatives to driving as public transport is not a viable option. This will force people to park just outside the RPS area, causing problems for those areas.</p> <p>c) The RPS will provide a considerable advantage to Cotham residents but the residents do not pay more council tax for this and their problems are no worse than those in other areas.</p> <p>d) Unless significant numbers of people switch to public transport, the advantage that Cotham residents receive will always be someone else's disadvantage.</p>	<p>1. The parking problems experienced by local residents have a variety of causes; a residents' parking scheme is the most effective way of prioritising parking for residents, businesses and their visitors.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>a) If residents in other local areas request a residents' parking scheme, then this could be considered.</p> <p>b) Cotham is close to frequent local bus and rail services. Cycling or walking may also be viable options for some journeys. The Council will consult residents of neighbouring areas within one year of implementing the scheme to look at the impact it has had on those areas.</p> <p>c) Residents who need to park in the area during the times of operation will need to purchase a permit to enable them to do so. The scheme is self-funding, rather than being funded from council tax revenues.</p> <p>d) The impact of the scheme on neighbouring areas will be assessed within a year of its implementation.</p> <p>e) Parking problems tend to worsen over</p>

	<p>e)Most residents would have been aware of parking problems when they bought their property so had 'fair warning'.</p> <p>3.It would cause inefficiencies:</p> <p>a)Parking will be pushed out, making it difficult or impossible for people to get to work.</p> <p>b)Some people who work in the area have unusual hours, eg schools and NHS staff, which would cause them serious difficulty as public transport is not a viable option.</p> <p>c)As with Kingsdown, the available parking will be seriously underused.</p> <p>d)The city centre and Whiteladies Road will become even more expensive places to visit and shop.</p> <p>The Cotham RPS is unfair for the reasons given above. The Council should improve public transport first as this scheme will make the lives of many people who work in the city very difficult.</p>	<p>time, so this is unlikely to be the case for many residents.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>a)People may use alternative forms of transport; the impact of the scheme on neighbouring areas will be assessed following implementation.</p> <p>b)The scheme will operate from 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday so people needing to park outside those hours will not require a permit.</p> <p>c)The scheme is designed to make it easy to park in the area. For this to be the case, there needs to be some spare parking capacity so that people do not have to drive around searching for a space.</p> <p>d)Pay & display parking is reasonably priced at £1 an hour for stays of up to three hours.</p> <p>Public transport improvements have taken place in recent years and further improvements are planned for future years, as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2026.</p>
<p>2. Resident of 4 Cotham Park North Bristol BS6 6BH</p>	<p>Installing and operating the scheme is a waste of money. If the revenue from the scheme is argued to cover the expense, the Council should reconsider whether they morally should be attempting to turn a profit from the people it is supposed to be representing and passing this on to a third party operating company.</p> <p>It will not solve parking problems, as it will displace them to adjacent areas. This has already happened with the Kingsdown RPS.</p> <p>Marking individual parking bays decreases the</p>	<p>The scheme has been designed to be self-funding. No third party operating companies are involved.</p> <p>Adjacent areas will be consulted about the scheme within a year of its implementation.</p> <p>Individual bays are not marked out; stretches of</p>

	<p>amount of parking space available because smaller cars will take up the same amount of space as larger ones.</p> <p>It will not reduce cars circulating for spaces, as drivers will still compete for free spaces and are likely to need to drive further to park.</p> <p>People will be discouraged from visiting the area if they have to pay & display. It will encourage illegal parking whilst people dash in to shops.</p> <p>Incentives should be given to households to travel sustainably instead of drivers being penalised.</p> <p>The scheme will encourage parents to park on keep-clear markings near schools rather than using the pay & display parking provided. This is already a problem for local schools.</p> <p>There are large numbers of properties under multiple occupancy. They will be particularly affected by the scheme.</p>	<p>the highway will be designated as parking space, which will accommodate varying numbers of vehicles depending on their size and how they are parked.</p> <p>It will remove the need to compete for space, as has been shown in Kingsdown.</p> <p>Pay & display parking is free for the first 15 minutes, which should accommodate this.</p> <p>The Council's transport policy is to encourage sustainable travel. Reducing commuter parking is one aspect of this, alongside improvements to public transport and encouraging greater walking and cycling.</p> <p>All households will be able to apply for three permits, each of which can carry two vehicle registration numbers. It is anticipated that most households will be able to manage their parking requirements in this way, particularly as the scheme only operates from 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday.</p>
<p>3. Resident of 73 Redland Road BS6 6AQ</p>	<p>Does not wish to object to the scheme; requests clarification regarding pay & display machine locations.</p>	<p>The precise locations of pay & display machines in the scheme area has not been determined at this stage. Every effort will be made to site the machines in such a way as to minimise their impact on the local environment.</p>
<p>4. Resident of 54 Archfield Road BS6 6BQ</p>	<p>Enquiring about whether there will be double yellow lines across their driveway. They had previously asked for these to be omitted.</p>	<p>This request can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>5. Resident of 17a Cotham Park Bristol BS6 6BZ</p>	<p>1. There are inadequate passing places on Hartfield Avenue.</p>	<p>1. We are increasing the lengths of double yellow lines on Hartfield Avenue to keep the emergency access to the school clear. This provides additional passing space over and above the existing double yellow lines and is considered sufficient to allow passing of</p>

	<p>2. There needs to be clarity about what permits the local schools would be able to apply for; they should be treated as a 'business'.</p> <p>3. Cotham Park and Archfield Road – there is a dangerous and obscured crossing at the northern end of Cotham Park where it meets Archfield Road. This is a major school crossing route; children currently cross in three ways after travelling north up Cotham Park on the eastern side of Archfield Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Follow the pavement round onto Archfield Road and step out between parked cars to cross over Archfield to the eastern side of Cotham Park North. b) At the corner between the parked cars they cross directly onto the eastern side of Cotham Park North. c) At the corner with Archfield they cross diagonally over the 'crossroads' and carry on down the western side of Cotham Park North. <p>There is no unobscured point to cross directly over Archfield Road if you are a pedestrian travelling along the eastern side of Cotham Park / Cotham Park North. As a minimum the double yellow lines at the junction of Cotham Park and Archfield Road on the eastern side of Cotham Park and the southern side of Archfield should be extended along Archfield Road.</p> <p>4. It is unfair that households with off-street parking can only apply for one permit, ie they can park two cars, whilst other households can apply for three</p>	<p>vehicles. It is also expected that the parking levels will be lower than currently experienced on this street once the scheme is in place.</p> <p>2. Schools and other organisations located in the scheme area will be able to apply for permits in the same way that a business can.</p> <p>3. The existing double yellow lines at this location were introduced in 2010 to address this issue and are considered to provide adequate visibility at this junction. There are no reported injury accidents in the last three years at this location and we have had no reports from parents or the schools in this area of issues since the restrictions were introduced.</p> <p>4. Most households with off-street parking have the option of leaving the access to their off-street parking unrestricted, which provides them</p>
--	--	---

	<p>permits, ie they can park three cars. Properties with off-street parking should be able to apply for two permits.</p> <p>5.The draft order refers to a book of 50 visitors' permits costing £1; it should say that the permits cost £1 each.</p>	<p>with a third space. Some households will have off-street parking that accommodates more than one vehicle.</p> <p>5. The final order will state that visitors' permits cost £1 each.</p>
<p>6. Resident of 4 Cambridge Crescent Westbury on Trym BS9 3QG</p>	<p>Works on Cotham Hill so needs to park in the area. His company employs over 100 people, many of whom park in the area.</p> <p>There have been strong feelings against this scheme in the area for many years. It is a money making scheme that will penalise residents and visitors for owning or using cars.</p> <p>Public transport is not a viable option. Was a cyclist but stopped cycling to work after a serious accident.</p>	<p>The available parking capacity on Cotham Hill and at the Cotham Hill end of the adjoining streets is currently allocated to limited waiting from 8.00am to 6.00pm, with a maximum stay period of one hour and no return within one hour. This has been designed to facilitate turnover of space and to enable visitors to the shops on Cotham Hill to park nearby. Commuter parking in the immediate Cotham Hill area is not possible under the existing arrangement; therefore, the introduction of the residents' parking scheme represents no change to the parking opportunities available to commuters.</p> <p>The residents' parking scheme is intended to facilitate visits to local businesses, in that it will be possible to park for up to three hours using the pay & display facilities that replace the current limited waiting. The company will be able to apply for two business permits for operational business vehicles and may also be eligible to apply for up to five 'customer permits' that can be used by their clients. In these respects, the scheme improves parking opportunities in the immediate vicinity for people visiting the business.</p> <p>The scheme is designed to prioritise parking in the wider residential area for use by local residents and their visitors. It is also intended to</p>

		<p>encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable forms of transport where possible. Cotham Hill is very close to local bus and rail services and walking or cycling may be realistic options for some employees. Bristol City Council is committed to supporting local employers in developing workplace travel plans, which may be appropriate in this instance.</p>
<p>7. Resident of 25 Hedgers Close Astone BS3 2SX</p>	<p>Works and shops in the area. Parking is difficult; the cost of other local parking is £10 a day, which is almost £2,600 per year.</p> <p>The scheme will have a negative impact on local businesses, as those without free parking nearby will see business suffer. Parking restrictions will encourage people to take risks by illegally parking, causing accidents and congestion.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
<p>8. Resident of 59 Arley Hill Cotham BS6 5PJ</p>	<p>Pleased to see that many improvements have been made to the plans and fully supports the scheme.</p> <p>Querying the proposals for the north end of Arley Hill, between Arley Park and the roundabout at the end of Redland Road. There is currently parking on both sides of the road up to the roundabout. This works well as most traffic travels south. The proposal restricts parking to one side and reduces the length by half. Could the Council consider keeping the current parking capacity?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This section of Arley Hill is two way, although there does seem to be an assumption by many motorists that the whole of Arley Hill is one-way. There is also a well-used cycle contra-flow on the one-way section as such high numbers of cyclists exit Arley Hill on to Cotham Brow. Parking on both sides of the road on this section does not provide sufficient width for two way movement of vehicles and there is insufficient space on the approaches to the parking for vehicles to wait for the road to clear without blocking either Arley Hill or queuing onto the roundabout and cyclists are particularly vulnerable at this location. Reduction in parking will improve access, particularly for cyclists.</p>

		There is an increase in parking spaces further along Arley Hill in place of a section of single yellow line.
9. Resident of 32 Abbotsford Road Redland BS6 6HB	<p>Responded to the non-statutory consultation stating that he did not want double yellow lines protecting the access to his driveway, yet they are still shown on the plans.</p> <p>Requests confirmation that no double yellow lines will be painted across the dropped kerb driveway access to 32 Abbotsford Road.</p>	This request is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.
10. Resident of 34 Ravenswood road Redland BS6 6BW	<p>Supports the outstanding waiting restrictions scheme for south Cotham but wishes to object to the residents' parking scheme proposals.</p> <p>Parking is slightly congested during the daytime but there are always some spaces available. The new scheme reduces flexibility and reduces the number of spaces available outside the daytime restrictions so when people return from work they may find it harder to park than at present.</p>	There is very little reduction in the amount of on street parking available to residents beyond the outstanding waiting restrictions, which will mainly restrict parking on junctions. Where parking is lost this is at locations where vehicles cannot park without either obstructing passage of large vehicles or by parking on the footway.
11. Resident of Greenway Cottage Wye View Lane Symonds yat West Herefordshire HR9 6BN	Lives in south Herefordshire and commutes daily by car to work in Cotham Hill. The company has some staff parking but this is usually filled with clients and more local employees. The specialised nature of the work required by the company means that they cannot only employ people who live within walking / cycling range.	See response to objection 6 above.
12. Resident of 33 Waverley Road Redland BS6 6ES	<p>Parking restrictions have not been accompanied by public transport improvements or additional low cost long stay parking provision. The scheme therefore punishes those who live elsewhere and Bristol City Council should represent everyone.</p> <p>Public transport is unreliable and makes it difficult to carry out duties of care, eg picking up children from school.</p>	The scheme is designed to prioritise parking in the wider residential area for use by local residents and their visitors. It is also intended to encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable forms of transport where possible. Cotham is very close to local bus and rail services and walking or cycling may be realistic options for some people.

	<p>Parking restrictions making the streets quieter when most people are at work or school is of debatable value. The stress on employees who must find more time looking for a parking space farther away from work may cause lost days off work and increased illness.</p>	<p>One of the aims of the scheme is to improve the quality of life for local residents, particularly those who need to use their car during the day and currently find it very difficult to park when they return home.</p>
<p>13. Resident of Flat 14 Osborne Road BS8 2HB</p>	<p>Lives in rented accommodation with no space for parking, so has no alternative but to park on her road. Walks to work so would have to pay to park during working hours despite not driving to work.</p> <p>Objects on the grounds that if it is introduced it could then spread to other areas, including Osborne Road. It may be hard to park in the area but penalising residents is not the solution.</p>	<p>The scheme will not include Osborne Road so her current parking arrangements would not be affected.</p> <p>Adjacent areas will be consulted about the scheme within a year of its implementation. Residents' parking schemes are designed to make parking easier for local residents, not to penalise them. The costs of the scheme to residents are kept to a minimum in order to achieve this.</p>
<p>14. Resident of 1 Berkeley Avenue Bishopston BS7 8HH</p>	<p>The spaces in the current controlled parking zone are under-utilised so there would be no benefit in extending this. This will force cars to squeeze into an even smaller area where they can park for free and will affect shops and businesses in Cotham because people will be reluctant to stop if they have to pay.</p>	<p>Local residents will benefit from the scheme because it will make it easier for them to park in their local area. Residents of neighbouring areas will be consulted about the impact of the scheme following its implementation. The scheme will improve access to shops and businesses by making parking in the area easier. Pay & display parking is free for the first 15 minutes; if people wish to visit shops and businesses for longer, they can park for up to three hours, which is an improvement on the one hour limited waiting currently in place.</p>
<p>15. Resident of 32 Northumbria Drive Henleaze BS9 4HP</p>	<p>Strongly objects as the scheme covers a huge and unrealistic area.</p> <p>The charges and restrictions will be damaging to the thriving community of shops on Cotham Hill.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>

	<p>Works at Films at 59 which has staff and clients who must be able to park for the duration of the working day because many come from outside Bristol and public transport is not an option for them.</p> <p>The Council should be supporting small and medium-sized businesses, not putting them at risk.</p>	
<p>16. Resident of 64 Harrowdene Road Bristol BS4 2JJ</p>	<p>The proposed scheme is unfair, dangerous and detrimental to local businesses.</p> <p>Parking for permit holders may improve during the day but would be unchanged in the evening, which is when require improvements the most. Walking alone in the evening can be uncomfortable for women and is statistically more dangerous for young men.</p> <p>Residents who benefit the most will be those who travel out of the area each day and return in the evenings, as they don't have to pay, whilst those who pay will still suffer problems in the evening.</p> <p>Paying to park will deter a lot of people from visiting local businesses. There will be huge cost implications for people coming into the area to work and for those who spend money with local businesses. Public transport in Bristol is too expensive and unreliable. Whilst revenue may be generated from permits, the cost of businesses leaving the area must be taken into account.</p>	<p>Although the scheme does not operate in the evenings, it is anticipated that the reduction in vehicles parked in the area during the day will lead to a reduction in the number of vehicles parked in the area at other times. In any event, the introduction of the scheme will not increase the need for residents to walk alone during the evenings compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The scheme will benefit all residents who park their vehicles in the area because it will make parking much easier. It will be of greatest benefit to those who need to use their car and return to the area during the day. Visitors to shops and businesses will find that it is easier to park nearby, so in that respect access to businesses will improve. The pay & display parking will enable visitors to park for up to three hours, which is an improvement in the current one hour limited waiting outside many shops and businesses.</p>
<p>17. Resident of The Old Post House Church Street Mark Somerset TA9 4LY</p>	<p>Objects because he has a long commute to work at Films @ 59 on Cotham Hill. The scheme will mean that he has to park further away, so it will take longer for him to get to work. It will inconvenience staff and clients and is</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>

	unnecessary.	
18. Resident of 4 Worcester Terrace BS8 3JW	<p>Insufficient thought has been given to this. People need a means of travelling to their destination. North Bristol has seen no improvement in public transport for years. Investment in highways, eg Whiteladies Road, has only served to clog up the area completely.</p> <p>Does not live in an area affected by the plans but is concerned about the effect that displaced traffic will have on other areas and their air quality. This needs to be thought about from a resident's perspective rather than as a money spinning idea.</p>	<p>The recent investment in Whiteladies Road was carried out as part of the Greater Bristol Bus Network scheme to improve public transport in the area.</p> <p>The residents' parking scheme aims to encourage people to use more sustainable forms of transport than the private car, which would improve air quality. However, other residential areas close to the scheme will be consulted about its impact within a year of its implementation.</p>
19. Resident of 56 Pinkers Mead BS16 7EF	<p>Strongly objects to the proposals. Commutes to work by car in order to get there quickly and get home in time for the school run. This would not be possible using public transport. It is not a problem as the parking space is only used once residents have left for work and is empty again before they come home.</p> <p>Works for a business that brings clients into Cotham, mostly by car, which then spend money in the area. If clients cannot park, this will have a knock-on effect on their businesses and other businesses in the area.</p>	See response to objection 6 above.
20. Resident of 3 Coleridge Vale Road South Clevedon BS21 6PE	<p>Strongly objects because people working in the area will not be able to park anywhere near to their workplace. This will not only be inconvenient but dangerous to female staff. There have been previous attacks on women walking after dark and this will make matters worse.</p> <p>Our previous objections have been ignored. The Council has put signs on lamp posts saying that</p>	<p>See the first paragraph of the response to objection 16 above.</p> <p>The comments made in response to the non-statutory consultation carried out in November</p>

	the scheme is going ahead.	2011 were fully considered before the amended scheme was advertised. The notices on lamp posts were informing residents that the statutory consultation was taking place and that there is now the opportunity to register a formal objection for consideration.
21. Resident of Hollow Farm Westbury Sub Mendip Wells Somerset BA5 1HH	<p>Commuter into Bristol by car and understands that local residents also need to park but would like a compromise to be found. Works in a very specialist area, so Bristol is the closest location for work. Commuting is expensive but is the only option available. Park & Ride is accessible but the hours are not suitable; the local bus service does not go very close to home and would take up to two hours each way.</p> <p>Where will the displaced traffic go? This will be extremely detrimental to those who work in the area.</p>	See response to objection 6 above.
22. Resident of 23 Cork Street Bath BA1 3BD	Works in the area. Objects because the scheme will have a very detrimental impact on local businesses and on the shops. The Council should be encouraging people to come into the area, not driving them away.	See response to objection 6 above.
23. Resident of First Floor Flat 19 Melrose Place BS8 2NG	The scheme would damage businesses in the area, as being unable to park near to smaller shops will discourage people from visiting them. There are not enough car parks in the area to make the scheme work. Business customers do not affect most residents during the day, as they are not there.	Visitors to shops and businesses will find that it is easier to park nearby, so in that respect access to businesses will improve. The pay & display parking will enable visitors to park for up to three hours, which is an improvement in the current one hour limited waiting outside many shops and businesses. One of the aims of the scheme is to improve the quality of life for local residents, particularly those who need to use their car during the day and currently find it very difficult to park when they return home.
24. Resident of 15 Trenchard Road	This should not even be considered as a valid proposal. It will be impossible for staff and clients	See response to objection 6 above.

Saltford BS31 3DT	to park their car. Shops and businesses will fail. Buses are not a valid alternative as they are too expensive.	
25. Resident of 7 Fern Close Brentry BS10 6RP	<p>Works at Films at 59 on Cotham Hill. They have many staff and clients who travel to them daily.</p> <p>Would have to walk to work if the scheme is introduced. This would extend her day by two hours. She is pregnant and is concerned about how long this would take and about personal safety in the area.</p> <p>Arrives at 8.30 when most residents have left the area and moves her car at the end of the day when residents need to park there, so does not think the scheme is needed.</p> <p>Queries how much pay & display would be available and how long it can be used for. All staff work long hours so need to park from 9-12 hours. This would be extremely expensive over a year.</p> <p>Manages a team that finishes shifts any time between midnight and 7am. Would be very concerned about staff not being able to park close by.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p> <p>The operating hours of the scheme are 9.00am to 5.00pm, so people working night shifts will not be affected.</p>
26. Resident of 43 St Annes Road St George BS5 8RB	<p>Works on Cotham Hill and would find it very difficult if the scheme prevented parking nearby. Public transport would be difficult due to shift changes.</p> <p>There do not appear to be any problems at the moment so the scheme is unnecessary.</p> <p>This will affect a lot of businesses that the Council should be trying to help.</p>	See response to objection 6 above.
27. Resident of	All of the staff employed by Films at 59 will be	See response to objection 6 above.

<p>27 Churchill Road Brislington BS6 6JR</p>	<p>affected if the scheme comes in, as will their clients.</p> <p>Residents can always park at the moment, as can people who work in the area.</p> <p>Is this a money making scheme?</p> <p>If it is brought in a lot of businesses are likely to close.</p>	<p>Many residents have difficulty parking at the moment. Access to shops and businesses on Cotham Hill is also difficult, which is why the current limited waiting was introduced.</p> <p>The scheme is designed to be self-funding rather than to make money.</p>
<p>28. Resident of 10 Ridge Crescent West Harptree BS40 6EE</p>	<p>Works irregular hours on Cotham hill and drives in as there is no public transport available.</p> <p>There are few spaces now and this will make it worse. How far away will the nearest parking be? How much would a public car park cost?</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
<p>29. Resident of 13 Redshelf Walk Brentry BS10 6NY</p>	<p>Works for a post production tv company on Cotham Hill. The scheme would be a big problem for staff and for clients who travel from across the globe to view their programmes. Urges the Council to develop a permit scheme that allows people who work in the area to park.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
<p>30. Resident of Bakerian Arches House 132 Cotham Brow BS6 6AE</p>	<p>Strongly objects as the removal of free parking in the area will cause significant harm to their business.</p> <p>It will not be practical for guests staying at the hotel to pay for parking in two-hour segments. Therefore, customers dependent on longer stay parking will no longer stay with them, which will damage their business. The information does not provide details of any exemptions for hotels etc.</p>	<p>The Council will contact them to discuss their specific requirements and how they can be accommodated within the provisions of the Order.</p>
<p>31. Resident of 35 Sydenham Road Cotham BS5 6BJ</p>	<p>It is an unfair charge that targets people with less income who live in flats. Richer people who own garages will not be affected. This is another way for the Council to make money.</p>	<p>The scheme is designed to be self-funding rather than to make money. Costs to residents have been kept to a minimum. The cost of a permit for one vehicle is £30, or 8p a day. Some residents may find that this cost is met by the</p>

	<p>Permits will damage people running their own business, eg electricians and painter/decorators, who service the flats and rely on parking close by to unload and carry out their work.</p>	<p>reduction in driving around the area searching for a space.</p> <p>Loading can be carried out anywhere in the scheme area. People working on properties in the area can park in a pay & display space for three hours or, for longer stays, may be able to obtain a visitors' permit from the residents of the property where they are working.</p>
<p>32. Resident of Garden Flat 27 Sydenham Hill BS6 5SL</p>	<p>The scheme is not needed for Sydenham Hill, as it is not difficult to park close to their flat. They can always park 5-10 metres away. This may be because Sydenham Hill is sufficiently far away from Gloucester Road and Stokes Croft. It may be beneficial for other streets but not Sydenham Hill.</p> <p>Objects to residents paying for permits. Charges or restrictions should only be applied to visitors to the area and not to residents and their visitors. Residents and their visitors should continue to be entitled to free parking.</p>	<p>The residents' parking scheme area needs to have coherent operational boundaries, so the decision of whether or not to introduce a scheme needs to look at whether it would be appropriate for the whole community rather than individual streets.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed to benefit residents and to be self-funding; permit charges are needed to fund the scheme, but have been kept to a minimum. A permit for one vehicle costs £30 per annum and each household is eligible for 50 free visitors' permits per annum.</p>
<p>33. Resident of 35/37 Hampton Park BS6 6LG</p>	<p>Requests that double yellow lines are not introduced outside their gate. The current arrangement is sufficient to deter blocking of their access and they would like to retain the facility of a space for visitors.</p>	<p>This request can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>34. Resident of 29 Archfield Road Cotham BS6 6BG</p>	<p>Objects to the proposal to implement double yellow lines outside their house and across their access way. They would like them removed to enable them to use the access as a space for their visitors as this would not have a detrimental impact on the rest of the scheme.</p>	<p>This request can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>35. Resident of 43 Cotham Hill Cotham BS6 6JY</p>	<p>Objects to the scheme on the grounds that it does not meet the objectives as set out in the Statement of Reasons, in particular 'to manage commuter parking to help ensure the expeditious,</p>	<p>It is the Council's view that the scheme does meet the objectives set out in the Statement of Reasons.</p>

	<p>convenient and safe movement of traffic and provide suitable and adequate parking facilities for residents, local businesses and visitors'. These conditions are not met in the Cotham Hill area as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current parking restrictions in the Cotham Hill area mean that commuter parking is not an applicable issue this part of the proposed scheme area. 2. The parking periods set out in the proposals will lead to vehicles being parked for a longer time on average and will effectively decrease the availability of spaces, which will increase the movement of traffic, thus having the opposite effect to that intended. 3. The scheme will adversely affect local businesses; as the average period of time that each vehicle occupies a space increases, the number of drivers visiting the local businesses will decrease. 4. The proposed scheme does not provide adequate parking for both residents and visitors. The nearest permit parking to Cotham Hill is some distance down the neighbouring streets. Had the parking areas off Cotham Hill and immediately off it been shared use bays, this would have addressed the problem. <p>There is no evidence that any changes have been made to the Cotham Hill section of the proposed scheme area following the informal consultation as claimed.</p>	<p>The response to the proposals from people who work on Cotham Hill and park nearby demonstrates that commuter parking is an issue in this part of the area.</p> <p>Many of the vehicles currently parking in the area will not be permitted to park, which means that those drivers that can park in the area will spend much less time searching for a space than at present.</p> <p>There will be more spaces available than there are at present, which will make access to local shops and businesses much easier. The increased parking time of three hours rather than one will make it easier for visitors to spend time shopping in the local area.</p> <p>The Council has carefully considered this issue following the response to the non-statutory consultation. It is a matter of striking a balance between providing for the competing needs of residents and local shops and businesses. Some changes were made to the original proposals before the scheme was advertised.</p> <p>The new proposals show shared use parking (for permit holders or pay & display) on Cotham Hill south of Aberdeen Road, which was previously proposed as pay & display only. Changes have also been made to the parking bays on Abbotsford Road, Aberdeen Road and Cotham Gardens by converting some pay & display only parking to shared use and some</p>
--	--	--

	<p>The area does not suffer from commuter parking as claimed; most cars belong to residents, including many students.</p>	<p>shared use to permits only.</p> <p>This provides a better balance for the area and will make it easier for residents to park without having an adverse impact on local businesses.</p> <p>The scheme will be reviewed during its first six months of operation, which will provide the opportunity to make further changes if necessary.</p> <p>Numerous objections have been received from commuters who park in the area, which demonstrates that this activity does occur.</p>
<p>36. Resident of 58 Archfield Road BS6 6BQ</p>	<p>Supports the Cotham RPS proposal in general but strongly objects to the proposals as advertised for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The suggestions that I made when responding to the online survey have not been incorporated into the proposals. 2.There are a number of students and families living on Archfield Road and finding a space in the evening can be challenging. It is worse during the day, but this does not impact on their daily activities. 3.The reduction in parking spaces will make the evening parking situation worse which will not provide 'suitable and adequate parking facilities for residents' as set out in the Statement of Reasons. 4.Parking on Archfield Road reduces traffic speeds. Opening up the road will allow cars to travel faster and will increase the risk to children in a family neighbourhood. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The request to remove double yellow lines and provide additional spaces can be accommodated and are included in the list of modifications to the scheme. 2.Although the scheme does not operate in the evenings, it is anticipated that the reduction in vehicles parked in the area during the day will lead to a reduction in the number of vehicles parked in the area at other times. 3. See response to point 2 above. 4. Whilst it is recognised that on-street parking does provide a traffic calming effect, it is unlikely that a reduction in the amount of on-street parking in these particular streets will result in any significant increase in speed. A lower density of parking than that currently

	<p>I would like the Council to confirm that my observations will be acted upon or to provide clarification they have been considered and the reasons for not following them to be provided.</p> <p>1.I previously requested that double yellow lines are not painted outside my drive. This has not been incorporated into the plans.</p> <p>2.I identified two further parking spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -1 space between the drives of 56 and 58 Archfield Road -1 space between the drives of 27 and 29 Archfield Road. 	<p>experienced will provide traffic calming benefits whilst improving visibility between pedestrians and vehicles. The scheme will be monitored after its introduction and, if necessary, there will be an opportunity to revisit the layout as part of the planned six month post implementation review.</p> <p>These requests can be accommodated and are included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>37. Resident of 24 Rokeby Avenue Redland BS6 6EL</p>	<p>Requests confirmation that double yellow lines are not painted in front of their driveway.</p>	<p>This request can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>38. Resident of 2 Rokeby Avenue BS6 6EL</p>	<p>Responded to the non-statutory consultation but has additional questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Did you take our reply to mean that we did or did not want double yellow lines across our driveway? 2.How committed to this are we now? 3.If we have yellow lines, can we block our own driveway with our own car? 4.Would we need a permit to do this? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The double yellow lines were retained following the non-statutory consultation. 2. It is proposed to remove the double yellow lines across the driveway as a result of further discussions. 3. No parking is permitted on double yellow

	<p>5.If we don't have yellow lines, will there be / could there be a break in the white marked parking bays, or are there other markings or restrictions?</p> <p>6.If so, could we park across our own drive and would we need a permit to do so?</p> <p>7.If someone else blocks our access, and we don't have double yellow lines, what can we do about it?</p> <p>8.Could you make sure that bays are sensibly sized to avoid leaving too small a space between our drive and the corner to fit a parked car?</p>	<p>lines.</p> <p>4. See response to point 3 above.</p> <p>5.If double yellow lines are not installed, there will be no markings or restrictions across the driveway.</p> <p>6. Any vehicle could park across the driveway and would not need a permit to do so.</p> <p>7. Double yellow lines are the only effective way to protect against this. There is nothing that could be done to remove a vehicle parked across your driveway if you were wishing to access your property, as the vehicle would be legally parked.</p> <p>8. This has been taken into account when designing the scheme.</p>
<p>39. Resident of 4 Henleaze Terrace BS9 4AS</p>	<p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <p>1.It will adversely affect the local economy, as people will drive to other areas rather than pay to visit local businesses.</p> <p>2.It will not reduce car use, as people will travel further to Cribbs Causeway.</p> <p>3.There is no satisfactory alternative to car use for commuters. Is a regular bus user and believes that buses on northerly routes are already frequent and punctual. The Council has wasted money trying to improve them unnecessarily and has failed to address the central issue of the excessive cost of bus transport.</p> <p>4.it is a money-making scheme at the expense of residents and visitors.</p>	<p>1.Parking close to local businesses will be much easier. Pay & display costs have been kept to a minimum, with 15 minutes of free parking and longer stays priced at £1 an hour. Depending on the length of stay required, it could cost more to travel to other destinations.</p> <p>2. See response to point 1 above.</p> <p>3.The residents' parking scheme and the improvements made to local bus services are key parts of the Council's overall transport strategy as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026. This aims to encourage people to use more sustainable forms of transport. The cost of bus transport is not set by the Council so cannot be included within our policy.</p>
<p>40. Resident of Basement Flat 23 West Park BS8 2LX</p>	<p>The Kingsdown RPS already puts pressure on local roads. This proposal means that those roads excluded from it, particularly West park, Aberdeen Road and Belgrave Road, will be severely</p>	<p>Residents of roads bordering the scheme will be consulted about the impact of the scheme once it has been implemented.</p>

	<p>affected by displaced parking.</p> <p>Whiteladies Road and Cotham Hill would have pay & display or limited waiting, reducing the parking spaces available to residents. Residents of these roads will be severely disadvantaged as commuters will be able to park there for free. There is already a lot of pressure on parking following the loss of Woodland Road due to the Kingsdown RPS.</p> <p>It would be more effective to include Aberdeen Road, Belgrave Road and West Park in either the Kingsdown or the Cotham RPS areas, so that all roads on this side of Whiteladies Road and Cotham Hill have some form of permit parking scheme to deter non-residents from parking there.</p> <p>Requests clarity on why those streets are not included in these proposals and asks whether they may form part of any future scheme.</p> <p>Would it be possible for residents of these streets to apply for parking permits if the Cotham scheme is approved? If it is possible to apply for permits then they would not object to the Cotham scheme.</p>	<p>Whiteladies Road is not included within the residents' parking scheme area so its parking arrangements will not change. The scheme will introduce some residents' parking to Cotham Hill, which will make it easier for residents of Cotham Hill to park close to where they live.</p> <p>The proposed scheme boundary was chosen to reflect a logically enforceable area of an appropriate size and nature. Residents of adjacent streets will be consulted about parking in their street after the scheme has been introduced.</p> <p>Only residents of households located within the scheme area will be able to apply for permits.</p>
<p>41. Resident of The Garden Flat 108 Redland Road BS6 6QU</p>	<p>It will increase costs for residents and visitors and will deter people from visiting local businesses. It will decrease quality of life as parking will become more of an issue, which will create stress.</p>	<p>The scheme has been designed to benefit residents and to be self-funding; permit charges are needed to fund the scheme, but have been kept to a minimum. A permit for one vehicle costs £30 per annum and each household is eligible for 50 free visitors' permits per annum.</p>
<p>42. Resident of 26 Manilla Road BS8 4ED</p>	<p>Owns a property within the area, which is let to students.</p>	<p>All households will be eligible for three residents' permits for the first year of the scheme. Whilst it is anticipated that there will be sufficient parking</p>

	<p>Believes that the wording concerning eligibility for a third permit is too vague and that a third permit should be allowed without the Council being able to withdraw it in the future.</p>	<p>capacity within the scheme area, this cannot be guaranteed. If residents are finding it difficult to park after the scheme has been introduced, it may be necessary to limit the number of permits issued per household to two when the permits are renewed.</p>
<p>43. Resident of 5 West Croft Henleaze BS9 4PQ</p>	<p>Strongly objects to the proposals.</p> <p>Their daughter attends the primary school on Aberdeen Road. Steve drives to work as it is more reliable, quicker, safer, healthier and a lot cheaper than privatised transport. If the proposals are introduced he will have to walk their daughter to school from farther away.</p> <p>Collecting their daughter from school takes approximately 30 minutes. The proposed 15 minutes is insufficient and the other options of paying £1 per day or walking from farther afield are unsatisfactory. Caroline collects their daughter after working in Clifton. There are no direct linked bus routes and the buses are unreliable, slow, unsafe and expensive. Caroline also reads with children at the school on Friday afternoons and does not feel it is reasonable to pay to park whilst doing so.</p> <p>If there were a tram system throughout the city that provided a cheap and fast alternative to the private car it would be wonderful. Until then the Council should consider ways of helping residents get around rather than hindering them.</p> <p>Seldom visits the city centre due to parking restrictions but does not have a choice about travelling to work and taking their daughter to school.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage people to use more sustainable forms of transport rather than the private car where possible. The Cotham area can be reached by local bus and rail services and walking or cycling may be realistic options for some journeys. Alternatively, the 15 minutes free parking in pay & display bays could be used for dropping off or collecting children.</p>

<p>44. Resident of 40 Archfield Road Cotham BS6 6BE</p>	<p>Has objected to residents' parking proposals nine times from 1999 to the present day. These proposals have been continually turned down by residents.</p> <p>1. We only heard about this by chance. All residents should have been sent a letter rather than only placing signs on lampposts.</p> <p>2. This is a wide residential road with no need for restrictions. There are no businesses, nightclubs or public houses on the road.</p> <p>3. It is a conservation area and as such, they object to meters and signs being introduced.</p> <p>4. The extra cost of enforcing the scheme cannot be justified. It is money-making scheme for the Council without regard to the wishes of Council tax payers.</p> <p>5. A permit for a specific car does not account for the occasional need for hire cars or replacement cars in the event of a breakdown being delivered to the resident when they are not at home. Who would pay or check the parking ticket?</p> <p>6. There would be enormous disruption and cost for builders and workmen. Visitors should not have to pay to visit family and friends.</p> <p>7. How would residents working all night be able to pay & display during the three hour time restrictions?</p> <p>8. We should not have to pay to park in the street that we live in.</p> <p>We have said No many times. Democracy has been bypassed.</p>	<p>Feedback from residents suggests that parking problems have worsened over time. The response to the non-statutory consultation was very supportive of the proposals.</p> <p>1. All residents were sent a letter at the non-statutory consultation stage. For the statutory consultation, the Council is only required to advertise the proposals in the local press. In addition to this, notices were placed on lampposts throughout the advertisement period and the information was also available on the Council's website.</p> <p>2. Many local residents are finding it difficult to park close to where they live. One of the main aims of the scheme is to prioritise parking for residents.</p> <p>3. The signs and pay & display machines will be installed as sympathetically as possible.</p> <p>4. The scheme is intended to be self-financing, not to make money.</p> <p>5. Residents could use a visitors' permit if they are using a different vehicle for one day.</p> <p>6. Each household can apply for 50 free visitors' permits per year. These could be provided to workmen if the resident chooses to do so.</p> <p>7. A permit or pay & display ticket is only needed between 9.00am and 5.00pm.</p> <p>8. The scheme has been designed to benefit residents and to be self-funding; permit charges are needed to fund the scheme, but have been kept to a minimum.</p> <p>The response to the non-statutory consultation was very positive.</p>
---	---	---

<p>45. Resident of Garden Flat 4 Eastfield road BS6 6AA</p>	<p>The scheme will be a significant financial burden on residents and local businesses whilst doing little to make it easier to park.</p> <p>Many households consist of groups of unrelated adults sharing, which is why each has more than one car. It is inequitable that they are to be penalised with inflated charges for second and third permits.</p> <p>It is relatively easy to park during the proposed operating hours of the scheme. Competition for space is greatest after 9pm when most residents are at home. It is unlikely that the scheme will make parking easier for residents.</p> <p>The scheme is unacceptable in the financial market. Parking should not be used to generate income to replace other Council deficits.</p>	<p>The scheme has been designed to benefit residents and local businesses by making it much easier to park. Feedback received in response to the Kingsdown case demonstrates that this has been achieved.</p> <p>Permit allocation is carried out on the basis of households rather than individuals. It is fair that the same charging structure applies to all households.</p> <p>Feedback from residents has shown that many find it difficult to park close to where they live during the day.</p> <p>The scheme is designed to be self-funding, not to generate income.</p>
<p>46. Resident of 21 Rokeby Avenue BS6 6EJ</p>	<p>Objects to two specific aspects of the proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Double yellow lines in front of 21 Rokeby Avenue rather than a permit parking place. There is room for a single parking bay similar to those in the Kingsdown scheme area. 2. Double yellow lines across the neighbour's half of their shared driveway. Has consulted with the neighbour and he agreed that there should be no double yellow lines in front of the joint driveway. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is only 4.3m between driveways at this location. This is considered to be too short a distance to introduce a parking bay, because a larger vehicle would over hang the space and obstruct the driveways of adjacent properties. 2. We have had no confirmation of this from the resident of 19 Rokeby Avenue.
<p>47. Resident of 59A Ravenswood Road BS6 6BP</p>	<p>Generally in support of the proposals.</p> <p>Has off-street parking which has been introduced after the original survey so is not shown on the plans. Does not want double yellow lines across their driveway and requests that these be removed.</p>	<p>This can be accommodated and has been included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>

	<p>Each household is entitled to three permits rather than the two originally quoted; has this changed following the original consultation? Can each permit carry three registration numbers?</p> <p>How are multi-occupied households dealt with? If a house is made into two separate flats will each flat be entitled to three permits? What about properties that contain large numbers of student bedsits?</p>	<p>This changed after the non-statutory consultation. Each permit can carry up to two registration numbers.</p> <p>Each household which has a separate address for Council Tax purposes will be entitled to up to three residents' permits and 100 visitors' permits per annum. Properties that are classed as student halls of residence are not eligible for any permits.</p>
<p>48. Resident of 195 Cheltenham Road BS6 5QZ</p>	<p>Parking problems are worse on Friday evenings and at weekends.</p> <p>All five houses in Brookfield Road are occupied by students who will not want parking meters. Objects to the proposal to have parking meters on this road.</p>	<p>Previous consultation has shown that there are parking problems during the day. It is considered that the proposed operating hours of the scheme will reduce parking in the area generally whilst being more flexible for residents than a scheme that is in place during the evenings and at weekends.</p> <p>Pay & display is intended to provide flexibility for all residents, as it may be more a more suitable way of accommodating visits than the visitors' permits. The review of the Kingsdown scheme found that residents wanted more pay & display to be introduced in the area.</p>
<p>49. Resident of 48 Ravenswood Road BS6 6BT</p>	<p>Happy with the scheme and pleased that tenants will be able to purchase permits.</p> <p>Does not want double yellow lines across the driveway. Would be happy with a white keep clear marking.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Keep clear markings cannot be provided within the scheme. Double yellow lines can be removed from across this access. This has been included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>50. Resident of 17 Trelawney Road</p>	<p>Residents of Trelawney Road should not have to pay to park on their road. Rents a property where</p>	<p>The scheme is designed to benefit residents by making it easier for them to park. It is intended</p>

BS6 6DX	four people live. Residents have always disagreed with the scheme so it should not be introduced.	to be self-funding and charges have been kept to a minimum. The non-statutory consultation demonstrated that there is support for the scheme in the area.
51. Resident of First Floor Flat 15 Hampton Road BS6 6HW	Requests confirmation that parking outside the property will be for permit holders only. If pay & display is introduced it will make parking much more difficult for residents.	It is proposed to introduced shared Residents' Permit and Pay & Display bays on the section of Hampton Road. Due to the anticipated overall reduction in on-street parking and the high level shared bays in this area we do not expect that the resident will experience any difficulties finding on-street parking close to their property.
52. Resident of 41 Cotham Hill BS6 6JY	<p>Has seen objection number 35 and wants those points to be considered as part of this objection as well. The matters raised are valid grounds for not implementing the proposal in its current form.</p> <p>Would welcome a scheme if it was fair and equitable for all residents; unfortunately this is not the case.</p> <p>The statement of reasons is not correct, as Cotham Hill does not have commuter parking problems.</p> <p>The scheme fails in its stated purpose to provide adequate parking for residents.</p> <p>There are 46 commercial properties on Cotham Hill and 37 homes and 9 flats which house a total of 128 adults. These people will be denied reasonable parking opportunities, as these spaces and those on side roads will be taken up by other residents. Requests the following amendments: 4. Additional shared use bays on Cotham Hill from Abbotsford Road upwards. 5. Include proper provision for motorcycles and facilities for bikes.</p>	<p>See response to objection 35.</p> <p>The Council considers the scheme to be equitable to all residents.</p> <p>Numerous objections have been received from commuters who park in the area, which demonstrates that this activity does occur.</p> <p>The Council has carefully considered this issue following the response to the non-statutory consultation. It is a matter of striking a balance between providing for the competing needs of residents and local shops and businesses. Some changes were made to the original proposals before the scheme was advertised.</p> <p>The new proposals show shared use parking (for permit holders or pay & display) on Cotham Hill south of Aberdeen Road, which was previously proposed as pay & display only. Changes have also been made to the parking</p>

	<p>6. There are many unused spaces on Woodland Road. Both schemes should be amended so that Cotham and Kingsdown residents can park there on permit parking. Most properties on that part of Woodland Road are university buildings rather than residential properties.</p>	<p>bays on Abbotsford Road, Aberdeen Road and Cotham Gardens by converting some pay & display only parking to shared use and some shared use to permits only.</p> <p>This provides a better balance for the area and will make it easier for residents to park without having an adverse impact on local businesses.</p> <p>The scheme will be reviewed during its first six months of operation, which will provide the opportunity to make further changes if necessary.</p>
<p>53. Resident of 149 Bloomfield Road BS4 3QR</p>	<p>Strongly objects to the proposals. Works in the area but lives some distance away. Car parks and public transport are too expensive and is unable to cycle. Walking would take 90 minutes each way.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
<p>54. Resident of 11 Hampton Park BS6 6LG</p>	<p>Both residents are 100% supportive of suggestion number 3 in objection 52 above.</p>	<p>See response to objection 52 above.</p>
<p>55. Resident of 24 Sydenham Road BS6 5SJ</p>	<p>Lives at 24 Sydenham Road. Their three garages are below their studio building at the bottom of their garden. Requests that double yellow lines are not painted in front of the garages.</p>	<p>This request can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>56. Resident of 20 Belgrave Road BS8 2AB</p>	<p>Residents' parking is greatly needed in Cotham. Enquires why Belgrave Road was not included in the scheme. Why was the boundary drawn where it is?</p>	<p>See response to objection 40 above.</p>
<p>57. Resident of 4 Ravenswood Road BS6 6BN</p>	<p>Supports the scheme overall but queries why landlords can be issued up to 10 permits. There are many let properties in this area, many accommodating 8 or more adults. If they are all to be given permits then the parking situation will not improve.</p> <p>It is not fair to issue perhaps to 10 people in a let</p>	<p>Landlords of properties within the scheme area are able to apply for one business permit for every 10 properties that they own, up to a maximum of 10 business permits if they own 100 properties. Each household will only be eligible for three residents' permits.</p>

	property whereas a family household would be restricted to 3 permits.	
58. Resident of 33 Lansdown Road BS6 6NR	Concerned about the impact on parking in the neighbouring areas. Lansdown Road is already affected by commuter parking, as are nearby streets in the Chandos Road area. The proposed scheme should include these streets if it goes ahead.	The Council is committed to fully consulting residents in adjacent areas about parking in their street after the scheme has been introduced.
59. Resident of 29 Collingwood Road BS6 6PD	Objects on the grounds that the proposal does not cover a large enough area. It should include Collingwood Road and surrounding streets. Parking is already very difficult, exacerbated by the fact that many houses are multi-occupancy student properties.	See response to objection 58 above.
60. Resident of 32 Roslyn Road BS6 6NN	Lots of commuters park in the roads near to Redland Station before catching the train to Temple Meads. The proposed scheme only includes the roads south of the station. Lives on a road north of the station and feels that the scheme will cause more commuters to park there. Concerned that the Council did not contact him about this scheme as a matter of course; instead, a concerned resident put a letter through his door.	See response to objection 58 above. The proposals were advertised in the local press and on the Council website, in addition to notices being displayed on lampposts in the scheme area.
61. Resident of 8 Aberdeen Road BS6 6HT	Does not oppose a scheme in principle or object to paying £30 a year. However, in its present form the proposal will make matters worse for the following reasons: 1. The scheme assumes that commuters are the main cause of local parking problems. This occurs but is not the main cause of the problem. The primary cause is the numbers of flats in the area and the number of cars owned by their residents. Who would be defined as a 'resident' in order to obtain a permit? It should be defined as narrowly as possible and not include students.	Noted. Each household in the scheme area will be able to apply for up to three residents' permits, irrespective of whether the members of that household or students or not.

	<p>2. There is no case for allowing more than two permits per household and there may only be sufficient parking capacity for one per household.</p> <p>3. The balance between residents and businesses is too much in favour of businesses. People working at local businesses can reach their place of work by public transport, but residents need to park their cars close to their home.</p> <p>4. Residents' parking will decrease the number of spaces available because the marked parking places end too far away from junctions.</p> <p>Would support a scheme which excludes students, restricts the number of permits to one or two per household, prevents workers from applying for permits and changes the existed limited waiting on Cotham Hill to residents' parking.</p>	<p>The Council believes that there is sufficient capacity to enable households to be issued with three permits. The scheme will be closely monitored and if there are problems with parking capacity, the number of permits per household could be reduced to two when they are renewed.</p> <p>The majority of parking capacity in the scheme area has been prioritised for residents. The Council believes that residents will find it much easier to park close to where they live than they do at the present time.</p> <p>Junction protection has been included in the scheme for safety reasons. It is anticipated that the reduction in the number of vehicles eligible to park in the area will make it much easier for residents to park, which will more than offset the reduction in space caused by junction protection.</p>
<p>62. Resident of 3 Arley Park BS6 5PL</p>	<p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Reduction in parking space for residents between the lower end of Cotham Brow / upper Arley Hill / Arley Park. It is proposed to remove 50% of the available parking on Arley Hill / Arley park. There is no obvious reason for this as parking on both sides of Arley Hill slows traffic down. Opening up the road will increase traffic speeds and make the road more dangerous. Where will residents park in the evenings? Have residents been consulted or listened to?</p>	<p>1. See response to objection 8 above. Additionally Arley Hill has traffic calming in the form of Road Humps and it is not expected that there will be a significant increase in speed as a result of these proposals.</p>

	<p>2. During the non-statutory consultation, we were told that the next set of proposals would be subject to more consultation and revision. This does not appear to be happening.</p> <p>3. Four parking spaces have been removed from the dead end of Arley Hill, for no reason at all. It does not appear that anyone has visited the area. All vehicles reverse in or out of the road so it was not necessary to facilitate a three-point turn here.</p> <p>4. Yellow lines are proposed on the dropped kerb to the rear of 57 Arley Hill, yet this entrance has been fenced off for 15 years and this is obvious if you visit the site.</p> <p>5. Owners of some properties are considering knocking down walls to allow off street parking. The extra vehicle access would remove parking for others. Have you considered the impact of this?</p> <p>Arley Park residents can park on their road at present. These proposals will displace cars from nearby roads onto the reduced space provided on Arley Park, which will make parking more difficult. It appears that the scheme is being pushed through despite residents' comments and by people who have not visited the area.</p> <p>We previously supported the scheme but now strongly object.</p>	<p>2. The proposals were revised after the non-statutory consultation into final proposals, which are the subject of the statutory consultation process. This was always the Council's intention.</p> <p>3. The purpose is to provide a turning space for vehicles to remove the need for reversing movements from a cul-de-sac on to a bus through road.</p> <p>4 There is a dropped kerb at this location and although the access is currently may not be in use, it could be returned to use at some point in the future.</p> <p>5. The creation of off-street parking would arguably relieve pressure on on-street spaces by removing some vehicles from the highway. However, Article 4 requires that a planning application be submitted in order to do this where the effects on the character of the area would be considered. The cost of converting a front garden would far outweigh the cost of a residents' permit.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the introduction of the scheme will remove parking from the whole area, which will make it easier for all residents to park, even where there is reduced parking capacity compared to the current parking arrangements.</p>
63. Resident of 1 Oakfield Court	Wishes to object in the strongest possible terms. The proposals can bring no benefit whatsoever to	The scheme is intended to benefit residents and local businesses by making it easier for people

<p>Oakfield Road BS8 2BD</p>	<p>residents and businesses in the area. The Council has shown little or no regard for their views and needs. The scheme is politically and financially motivated and is about greed rather than providing services. The proposals should be withdrawn.</p>	<p>to park nearby. It is not intended to make money.</p>
<p>64. Resident of St Michaels Hospital Southwell Street BS2 8EG</p>	<p>The scheme has huge implications for NHS theatre staff working at St Michael's Hospital. Supports green travel policies but feels that there is no robust travel plan in place to provide reasonable alternatives to parking on residential streets.</p> <p>The nearest Park & Ride facility is at Portway but that takes staff out of their way. There needs to be a Park & Ride at Cribbs Causeway for north Bristol but there is no evidence of this in the Joint Local Transport Plan. The existing Park & Ride schemes are expensive compared to other cities.</p> <p>They would not be able to use the pay & display as the maximum stay time is three hours.</p> <p>The NHS Foundation Trust has negotiated a reduced parking fee for staff at Trenchard and Barton Street NCP car parks bus spaces are limited so not all of the staff that need them can access them.</p> <p>Requests that the residents' parking scheme be delayed until suitable alternatives are in place. It is already difficult to recruit skilled theatre staff and this scheme will make this worse.</p>	<p>One of the aims of the scheme is to encourage people to travel to work using more sustainable forms of transport where possible. By restricting commuter parking in residential areas, the scheme will make a significant contribution towards tackling congestion, improving road safety and air quality and increasing the use of public transport and cycling by reducing the number of people commuting into the city by private car. The Joint Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2026 provides a framework for introducing residents' parking as part of the integrated transport strategy for the sub-region. The area is very close to local bus and rail services and walking or cycling may be realistic options for some employees.</p>
<p>65. Work address of University of Bristol University Walk BS8 1TD</p>	<p>Lives in the Chew Valley and drives 14 miles each way to work at Bristol University, parking on Archfield Road or Cotham Park.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>

	<p>Public transport does not meet his working requirements as he works flexible hours and often needs to return home at short notice.</p> <p>Assumes that the parking restrictions are intended to make money, yet there are many unused spaces in areas where parking is already restricted. He will have no alternative but to pay to park and feels that the proposals are unnecessary and exploit people who have no option but to commute into Bristol.</p>	
66. Resident of 1 Oakfield Court Oakfield Road BS8 2BD	This will penalise local businesses that are already struggling in the economic climate. Businesses in Cotham Hill support the broadcasting industry and need to provide access for clients and visitors. We should be encouraging these businesses and should not introduce these restrictions.	See response to objection 6 above.
67. Resident of 1 Oakfield Court Oakfield Road BS8 2BD	Parking is already very difficult for people working near Whiteladies Road. Cotham is the only unrestricted area left and if these restrictions are brought in it will be almost impossible to park.	See response to objection 6 above.
68. Resident of Norwood House 2.1b Bath BA2 7AY	Lives on Cheltenham Road and usually parks on Brookfield Road. The scheme is a tax on people who do not have a driveway. Needs a car to commute to work in Bath and it is unfair to have to pay for a permit.	The scheme is intended to benefit residents who do not have a driveway by enabling them to park close to where they live more easily. The scheme operates from 9.00am to 5.00pm so a permit will not be needed in order to park in the area at other times.
69. Resident of 11 Rokeby Avenue Redland BS6 6EJ	<p>1.Has the cost of permits been amended? £200 for a third permit is too high.</p> <p>2. Has an off-street parking place but there are three cars in the household. If he could park across his drive it would be okay but needs to be sure that there are no double yellow lines there.</p>	<p>1.The cost of permits is £30 for a first permit, £80 for a second and £200 for a third.</p> <p>2.The double yellow lines that were proposed can be removed and this is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme. However, this does not guarantee that the unrestricted space will be sufficient to park a vehicle.</p>
70. Work address of Films@59	Works at Films at 59 on Cotham Hill. They have a policy so that they do not have to walk to their	See response to objection 6 above.

<p>59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR</p>	<p>vehicle in the dark but if they cannot park anywhere close to work then they will be very vulnerable.</p> <p>If the proposal goes ahead the Council should consider better street lighting as the roads are not very well lit.</p> <p>The scheme will be inconvenient for clients as well as staff, which could lead to loss of business.</p>	
<p>71. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR</p>	<p>This will severely affect business at Films at 59. Clients and staff come and go at all times and often need to park for much longer than three hours. It is difficult now with the 1 hour stay, but some of the residential streets have spaces available.</p> <p>Students' vehicles are the main cause of parking problems; it is much easier to park outside term times. Regulating students' vehicles would be a much more effective way of solving the problem, if there is a problem.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p> <p>Students are encouraged not to bring cars with them to university, but this is difficult to enforce. The scheme ensures that all households are eligible for the same number of permits whether they are students or not, as this is the most equitable solution for residents.</p>
<p>72. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR</p>	<p>Strongly opposed to the proposed.</p> <p>Parking facilities have been eroded over recent years. The Kingsdown scheme has made this much worse. It does not help residents as they need to park at night and it penalises businesses.</p> <p>They have national and international clients and a high proportion of commuters who cannot use public transport due to working anti-social hours.</p> <p>If the parking zone goes ahead they may need to consider relocating to an area of Bristol that is unrestricted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Many residents need to park close to where they live during the day for a variety of reasons and they are finding this extremely difficult. The scheme will make parking in the area easier for visitors to businesses.</p> <p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>

	Feels that the Council keeps trying to push the proposals through until it succeeds.	
73. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR	This will damage jobs and industry by ruining people's chances of parking close to their work.	See response to objection 64 above.
74. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR	Works in the area and requires a place to park on a regular basis. Buses would need to be cheaper and more reliable to reduce the amount of cars in the area. This scheme will encourage people to park in other areas instead which will cause problems for the residents there. The scheme will be detrimental to those with young children and could cause some people to have to change jobs or give up work altogether. This will be detrimental to the Council as the city will lose business.	See response to objection 64 above.
75. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR	Works on Cotham Hill and lives on the other side of the city so needs to drive to work. The scheme will seriously affect her lifestyle and restrict her work. Has young children and has designed her working pattern to fit around their school time; this scheme means compromising her work or family life. The scheme is not welcome in this area.	See response to objection 64 above.
76. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR	Works on Cotham Hill and commutes from 30 miles away. Has previously commuted using public transport but this was financially and logistically difficult. Using a car reduced commuting time from 5 hours a day to 2 and was cheaper. Has previously worked in London, which has viable public transport alternatives. It is not realistic to suggest that this is true of Bristol.	See response to objection 64 above.

	<p>There are a large number of people in this situation, which may have an impact on the sustainability of the vibrant nature of the area.</p>	
<p>77. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR</p>	<p>Works on Cotham Hill and regularly travels between work, ITV West and home in North Bristol with heavy equipment. It is already difficult to park and this scheme will make it worse.</p>	<p>The scheme will make it easier to park nearby for period of up to three hours, which is an improvement on the current one hour limited waiting arrangements on Cotham Hill and the surrounding streets.</p>
<p>78. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR</p>	<p>Works for Films at 59 and is based at several sites near Whiteladies Road. Regularly parks in the Aberdeen Road / Abbotsford Road / Hampton Road area. Is often required to make site visits during the day and feels that introducing pay & display into the area is an obvious attempt to increase parking revenue. However, if introduced, most spaces would be empty because regular visitors cannot afford to pay, as seen on Woodland Road.</p> <p>The scheme will only provide minimal benefit to residents as most of them are at work during the day. The result will be that parking space which is valuable to local business will remain empty all day. The needs of businesses must be considered before making this decision.</p>	<p>See response to objection 77 above.</p> <p>Many residents need to park close to where they live during the day for a variety of reasons and they find this very difficult. The residents' parking scheme is intended to facilitate visits to local businesses, in that it will be possible to park for up to three hours using the pay & display facilities that replace the current limited waiting.</p>
<p>79. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR</p>	<p>It is disgraceful that the Council has gone ahead with this scheme. It will hinder everyone working in the area and is a selfish decision to make more money.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>
<p>80. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR</p>	<p>The proposals are biased against businesses. Films at 59 employs over 100 people and brings a similar number of clients into the area each week. The company makes a valuable contribution to the neighbourhood. If parking restrictions force them out of the area then local clients would have to</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>

	travel further to reach them. They should be offered more than two business permits.	
81. Work address of Films@59 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR	<p>They are concerned that this process is the only phase of consultation.</p> <p>Removing parking spaces could cause a crisis for their business. They work shifted hours and have a large number of national and international clients who often work late into the evening. Public transport is not efficient or consistent enough to provide an appropriate service to their clients.</p> <p>Their business has a strong green agenda and promotes cycling to work but this scheme has too great an impact on the local area. There is no real incentive for people to use public transport as the routes are not direct enough and it is not quick enough.</p> <p>They want to stay in the area and support the local economy – they have 125 staff and make a valuable contribution to local businesses. Residents' parking exists in Bath but there is also a large selection of affordable parking for use by businesses and the general public.</p> <p>The money spent on this scheme would be better spent on other things.</p> <p>As the Managing Director of the business, she would be happy to come to a meeting to discuss the matter in more detail.</p>	<p>The proposals were subject to non-statutory consultation during November 2011.</p> <p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
82. Resident of 12 Clyde Park BS6 6RS	Disappointed that residents in neighbouring areas have not been consulted. Parking is already difficult, particularly with people parking and walking to work and with student cars during	

	<p>university term times.</p> <p>Pleased to see the new double yellow lines on corners but thoughtless pavement parking continues. Double parking regularly occurs around the Oval which creates access problems.</p> <p>Feels that it is necessary to object to this scheme as it will make the situation in neighbouring areas worse, although supports the idea of residents' parking in principle. Would support the area being extended to include this part of Redland.</p>	
<p>83. Resident of 29 Chandos Road Redland BS6 6PQ</p>	<p>Objects to Chandos Road not being included in the scheme. It is already difficult to park there. The recent restrictions are welcome but have reduced the available parking space. Her father has a Blue Badge and regularly parks over two streets away. Much of the pressure on parking space is caused by people who work in central Bristol.</p> <p>Fully supports the idea of the scheme and feels that it should be significantly extended to avoid a negative impact on nearby residents.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>84. Resident of 7 Arley Hill BS6 5PH</p>	<p>Objects to the stretch of Arley Hill between Arley Cottages and Cheltenham Road being designated as shared use parking because it is a residential stretch of road.</p> <p>There is a strong likelihood that the spaces will all be taken by pay & display users and that residents will be unable to park. Shared use bays should be on sections of the highway that are not fronted by residential properties. Residential areas should be residents' only.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the scheme will remove sufficient parking from the area to make it easier for residents, businesses and their visitors to park without competing for space in the way that they do at present. Experience from the Kingsdown scheme area is that shared use parking is convenient for residents as it provides additional flexibility for managing visits etc.</p>
<p>85. Resident of 2 Cotham Park North</p>	<p>Bristol City Council has not accepted the results of previous consultations, which have shown clear</p>	<p>These proposals were subject to non-statutory consultation, which found that they were</p>

BS6 6BH	<p>objections to the proposal.</p> <p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There will be no benefit to residents as parking outside their home is not guaranteed. 2. Schools staff need to be able to park close to their place of work. 3. University staff need to be able to park close to their place of work. 4. Hospital staff all park in this area to get to work and people visiting the hospitals for treatment also park here. 5. The only purpose of the scheme is to generate revenue for the Council. 6. In Kingsdown there are empty spaces where cars could park. Instead, people working in the area park further out, causing inconvenience elsewhere. 	<p>supported by local residents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reduction in parking in the area will make it much easier for residents to park close to where they live. 2. See response to objection 64 above. 3. See response to objection 64 above. 4. See response to objection 64 above. The scheme will make visits to facilities in the area much easier as there will be more parking space available than at present. 5. The scheme is not intended to generate revenue; it is designed to be self-funding. 6. It is anticipated that some spaces will be empty, as this is a consequence of making it easier for people to park.
86. Resident of 88 Hampton Road BS6 6JB	<p>Objects to not being included in the proposals.</p> <p>It is already very difficult to park close to his home and the scheme may make it impossible.</p>	See response to objection 58 above.
87. Resident of 19 Elgin Park Redland BS6 6RX	<p>Objects because her area is not included and the scheme will exacerbate an already difficult situation. Non-residents already park on her road. Why should she subsidise the people that the Council is trying to discourage from parking?</p>	See response to objection 58 above.
88. Resident of 35 Ravenswood Road Redland BS6 6BW	<p>Has parked in the existing disabled bay since 1995. Believes that the Council will be replacing it with double yellow lines. Strongly objects to this and asks to keep the existing disabled bay.</p>	The Council will contact them to discuss their current requirements.
89. Resident of Froomsgate House Rupert Street BS1 2QJ	<p>Objects to the scheme on the grounds that it will cause even more non-residents to park in their street, which is already a problem.</p>	See response to objection 58 above.
90. Resident of	Does not have a problem with parking in the area	The scheme is intended to make it easier for

<p>11a Eastfield Road Cotham BS6 6AA</p>	<p>currently and feels that the scheme is not needed. It is just another tax.</p> <p>It will also cause difficulties as 50 visitors' permits is not enough. This needs to be increased to 100 to cover workmen etc.</p> <p>The Council has not given enough thought to this scheme or advertised it sufficiently. Has only received 1 previous survey and the notices on lampposts are easily missed.</p> <p>Would like to make the following points in relation to Eastfield Road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are only 2/3 proposed spaces on Eastfield Road, so she would still be unable to park after buying a permit. 2. The current disabled space is shown on the plans but there never seems to be a car with a disabled badge parked there. Is this bay definitely needed? 3. The area shown as no parking outside the new development on Eastfield Road means a loss of two spaces that she currently uses. There is no reason why these spaces should be lost. 	<p>residents to park. It is not intended to generate revenue and permit costs have been kept to a minimum.</p> <p>An additional 50 visitors' permits can be purchased per annum, at a cost of £1 per permit.</p> <p>The proposals were the subject of non-statutory consultation last November. The final proposals were advertised in the local press and on the Council's website as well as on the notices on lampposts.</p> <p>It will be easier to park in the whole area and the permits can be used in any of the permit holders and shared use bays provided.</p> <p>It is proposed to remove this bay as it is no longer required. This is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>An additional parking bay can be provided. This is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>91. Resident of Flat C, 108 Cotham Brow BS6 6AP</p>	<p>Does not object to parking costs for non-residents, but does not understand why residents must pay for permits. The costs of the scheme should be met by the charges for non-residents and income from fines.</p> <p>Objects to any charges unless figures can demonstrate the need for the charges to be set as they are. His household has two cars which both need to be parked on the road. Even if the figures</p>	<p>The scheme is designed to benefit residents and to be self-funding. Permit costs have been kept to a minimum.</p>

	<p>show this, he objects on the grounds that the scheme is too expensive. If there are no figures available, this shows that the scheme is an additional tax, which he refuses to pay.</p>	
<p>92. Resident of 14 Clyde Park Redland BS6 6RS</p>	<p>Residents' parking is making it increasingly difficult to park in Clyde Road. Commuters who work in the city centre are parking there for the whole day. Woodfield Road is a particular problem due to pavement parking, which means that she often has to walk in the middle of the road with a pram.</p> <p>Requests that Woodfield Road and Clyde Road be included if the scheme goes ahead.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>93. Resident of 21 Clyde Road Redland BS6 6RJ</p>	<p>Objects to the scheme because it will make it more difficult to park in her road. Parking is already a problem during the week due to hospital and university staff parking there.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>94. Resident of 9 Woodfield Road BS6 6JH</p>	<p>Parking in Woodfield Road is already difficult; this is made worse by the houses of multiple occupancy.</p> <p>Would support the scheme if it were expanded to include Woodfield Road.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>95. Resident of 16 Clyde Park BS6 6RS</p>	<p>Objects because the scheme will force commuter parking into adjacent areas such as Clyde Park. They already suffer and this will make the situation intolerable. There are already problems with refuse collections and deliveries on some days.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>96. Resident of 3 Oakhill Crescent Aberdeen AB15 5HY</p>	<p>They travel from Aberdeen to visit their son and daughter-in-law in Redland. They have a similar scheme in Aberdeen, which means that visitors have to park outside the scheme area. They have a Blue Badge but will find it very difficult to park close enough to their son's house.</p>	<p>Parking will be easier throughout the scheme area due to the reduction in the number of vehicles permitted to park there. Blue badge holders can park in the shared use and the pay & display bays free of charge.</p>
<p>97. Resident of</p>	<p>Supports the idea in principle but wishes to object</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>

<p>14 Clyde Park Redland BS6 6RS</p>	<p>on the grounds that it will have a detrimental effect on surrounding roads. The loss of available parking in the scheme area will push the problem into their street.</p> <p>Would like the scheme to be extended into Redland so that they will be included from the outset.</p>	
<p>98. Resident of 18 Clyde Road Redland BS6 6RW</p>	<p>Unaware of the scheme until the last day of advertising. Strongly objects to it going ahead without proper consultation with those would be affected by it. It will have a significant negative impact on the area, as the Kingsdown scheme did. Does not want this to happen in Redland.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>99. Resident of 18 Clyde Road Redland BS6 6RW</p>	<p>Objects on the same grounds as objection 98 above.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>100. Resident of 8a Cotham Lawn Road Cotham BS6 6DU</p>	<p>1.Does not want double yellow lines outside the dropped kerb. Could these be deleted from the proposals? 2.Double yellow lines are also shown outside the dropped kerb access to number 9, but his neighbour has asked for these to be removed. 3.The existing parking space between numbers 8a and 9 is to be removed and replaced by double yellow lines. Requests that this not be done and that the current space be retained.</p>	<p>These requests can be accommodated and are included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>101. Resident of 2 Southfield Road BS6 6AY</p>	<p>The scheme will significantly reduce parking capacity. In addition, residents will have no priority over people using pay & display. Therefore, the scheme cannot possibly benefit residents.</p> <p>There are other problems which will occur if the scheme is implemented: 1.Pavements in Fremantle Road are narrow</p>	<p>The scheme will make it much easier for residents to park in the area than at present, due to reduction in the number of vehicles parking in the area.</p> <p>Pay & display machines will not be located in</p>

	<p>and pay & display machines would obstruct pedestrians, especially those in wheelchairs or with pushchairs.</p> <p>2.The northwest part of Fremantle Road is a car crime hotspot due to ‘blind’ areas caused by high retaining walls. Vulnerable drivers needing to use pay & display machines would be an easy target for opportunistic thieves.</p> <p>3.The presence of pay & display machines will encourage incidents of public disorder.</p> <p>4.Their retaining walls require regular maintenance which would be impossible if a pay & display machine were sited nearby.</p>	<p>areas where the pavements are too narrow.</p> <p>There is no evidence that this has caused problems elsewhere in the city.</p> <p>See response to point 2 above.</p> <p>This will be taken into account when deciding on the location of the machines.</p>
<p>102. Work address of Colston’s Primary School 18 Cotham Grove BS6 6AL</p>	<p>The school has no off-street parking and employs 58 people. Staff already struggle to find parking spaces nearby and potential applicants visiting the school have said that the lack of parking would discourage them from applying to work there.</p> <p>The scheme will mean that staff have to park in streets outside the area, which will extend their days and cause those streets to become congested. Key workers should be entitled to permits in the same way that residents are.</p> <p>Concerned that the scheme will increase the traffic caused by parents driving round the area searching for a space and suggests that the scheme hours be reduced to 9.15am – 3.15pm.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>
<p>103. Resident of 52 Archfield Road BS6 6BQ</p>	<p>Requests that proposed double yellow lines across their driveway are not implemented, as they would like to use this space to enable visitors to park.</p>	<p>This can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>104. Resident of 132 Cotham Brow BS6 6AE</p>	<p>See objection 30.</p> <p>Concerned that they will suffer a significant loss of business if the scheme is introduced as their</p>	

	guests depend on free long-stay parking.	
105. Resident of 88 Hampton Road BS6 6JB	Objects on the grounds that where he lives is not included in the scheme. Parking is already a major problem and is predominantly caused by commuters who work in the city centre. If the scheme is introduced, it will make this much worse and he may not be able to park near to his home at all.	See response to objection 58 above.
106. Resident of 19 Elgin Park BS6 6RX	Requests that the Council strongly considers extending the scheme to Elgin Park. In recent years, parking by non-residents has become a major problem and he often has to park some distance away from his home. Non-residents park nearby and then commute on foot or by bus. We need a parking policy that reflects the needs of the community.	See response to objection 58 above.
107. Resident of 5 Woodfield Road BS6 6JH	Supports the idea of residents' parking in principle. Objects on the grounds that this scheme will have a very negative impact on roads adjacent to the scheme area, as it will push the problem into those streets. Their road is very narrow and already suffers from pavement parking. People walking into town use the road for parking and the presence of students' cars exacerbates this problem. This problem should be resolved in collaboration with the University. In the short term, the scheme should be expanded up Hampton Road to Clyde Road and include Woodfield Road and Clyde Gardens. If this were done they would support the scheme.	See response to objection 58 above. The University encourages students not to bring a car to Bristol but this is very difficult to monitor or enforce.
108. Resident of 27 Archfield Road Cotham	In favour of a residents' parking scheme in principle as access for delivery and emergency vehicles is difficult.	Noted.

<p>BS6 6BG</p>	<p>Requests that proposed double yellow lines across his driveway are not installed. The advertised scheme shows a gap in the double yellow lines outside the wall of number 29; he is concerned that this may have been mistaken as being outside his drive as he requested the removal of the lines in the earlier consultation.</p>	<p>The removal of the lines can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>109. Resident of 16 Collingwood Road BS6 6PD</p>	<p>Has been informed of the scheme by John Mercer (see objection 112).</p> <p>Agrees with Mr Mercer's concern about the knock-on effect in neighbouring areas.</p> <p>Lives on Collingwood Road. The introduction of double yellow lines on corners was a good decision and necessary but has had the effect of reducing parking capacity. Four spaces will shortly be lost from his road and the displacement of vehicles from the residents' parking scheme area will make this problem worse.</p> <p>Many cars parked in the area belong to students who rarely use their cars. If the scheme is introduced, it is anticipated that there will be many more of these vehicles parked in his area which are currently in the residents' parking scheme area.</p> <p>His position is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the proposed scheme because it does not go far enough. If residents' parking must be introduced it should extend as far as the Downs. 2. Does not object to residents' parking schemes in general. His view is an objection 	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>

	<p>to the proposed scheme but could be seen as an endorsement of it coupled with a request to extend it to his area.</p>	
<p>110. Work address of Director of Facilities and Estates University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust BS2 8HW</p>	<p>Objects on behalf of the Trust.</p> <p>The Trust employs a significant and diverse workforce of 8,000 people based at six sites in the centre of the city. Their staff come from a variety of locations, with public transport being out of reach of many of them.</p> <p>They have a travel plan and have achieved modal shift for large numbers of staff for whom there is a sustainable alternative. However, car travel is the only option for many staff. As a result, some choose to park in the residential areas around the hospital sites.</p> <p>The Kingsdown scheme has led to people parking further away, including in Cotham.</p> <p>Objects on the grounds that the Council is not doing enough to compensate for the reduction in parking. This is a parochial and unsustainable position.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>
<p>111. Work address of Hampton House Health Centre BS6 6AU</p>	<p>Works at Hampton House Health Centre as a physiotherapist. There is some staff parking on site but it is limited and does not provide for staff that need to travel to and from the site during the day to carry out home visits or to work at other locations.</p> <p>Better bus services would reduce the need to drive.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>
<p>112. Resident of 90 Hampton Road Redland</p>	<p>Wishes to strongly object, on the grounds that his stretch of road is not included within the scheme area. The scheme would have an extremely</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>

<p>BS6 6JB</p>	<p>negative impact on parking in all areas around the perimeter of the scheme.</p> <p>It is already very difficult to park in Hampton Road. Much of this is caused by people parking there and walking into the city centre. The loss of parking in the scheme area will cause even more people to do this in the streets outside the area.</p> <p>A 'double-whammy' effect will be created as people who live outside the proposed scheme area currently need to park within it sometimes and will not be able to if the scheme goes ahead.</p> <p>The proposed permit charges are far too low. The second permit cost of £80 in particular is minimal and not enough to encourage reduction in car use.</p>	
<p>113. Resident of 16 Blackwells Dursley GL11 4BG</p>	<p>Works as a physiotherapist at the BRI. Unable to apply for parking there due to the lack of spaces. Public transport does not fit in with her shift patterns. Parks in Cotham and is concerned at having to walk further to get to work if the scheme is introduced.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>
<p>114. Resident of 35 Alexandra Park Redland BS6 6QB</p>	<p>Objecting on the grounds that the stretch of road on which they live is not included in the proposed scheme area.</p> <p>Remainder of objection mirrors contents of objection 112.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>115. Resident of 4 Clyde Park BS6 6RR</p>	<p>Supports residents' parking schemes in general but is objecting on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There has been no formal consultation with residents immediately outside the area. The scheme will have a considerable impact on those streets as students and people walking to work in the centre will park there instead of in the scheme area. 	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>

	<p>2.Residents' parking should be extended up to Redland Road. There are many narrow streets such as Woodfield Road immediately outside the area where parking is very tight and cars are often parked on pavements. The scheme will make this worse and there is a risk that emergency service vehicles will be unable to access the area.</p>	
<p>116. Resident of 2 The Dell Westbury on Trym BS9 3UD</p>	<p>As a residential area outside the commercial centre of Bristol, Cotham is not appropriate for restricted parking. She has visited the area many times and has never found it difficult to park, even after the introduction of the Kingsdown scheme.</p> <p>The impression given of poor parking in the area is misleading and extremely infrequent. It would be easily solved by double and single yellow lines and more enforcement.</p> <p>The published statement of reasons is false and cannot be legally justified.</p>	<p>The non-statutory consultation that was carried out regarding the initial proposals found that many residents experience difficulties parking.</p> <p>Additional waiting restrictions would prevent dangerous parking, but would solve the problem of insufficient parking capacity for residents.</p> <p>The Council believes that the statement of reasons is correct.</p>
<p>117. Resident of 22 Woodfield Road Redland BS6 6JQ</p>	<p>Is aware of objection number 107. Is writing to object to the suggestion of extending the scheme to Woodfield Road that is made in objection 107. This is for the following reasons:</p> <p>1.107 refers to parking problems caused by students. This is discrimination, which is not justifiable grounds on which to decide to extend the scheme. Most houses in Woodfield Road have two cars whether they are occupied by students or not.</p> <p>2.As a full time home-based worker, she is aware that more cars are used for going to work rather than school or college. Therefore, parking is not an issue during the day. The scheme would not make a difference to parking in the evenings.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p> <p>Feedback from residents suggests that parking problems in the area have a number of causes.</p> <p>Many residents experience difficulties finding a parking space during the day.</p>

	<p>3.Extending the scheme to Woodfield Road and Chandos Road would have a negative effect on local businesses and shops, particularly on Chandos Road.</p> <p>4.There is a nursery on Woodfield Road. Introducing a scheme could put young children at risk as parents would not be able to park safely when dropping their children off or collecting them.</p> <p>5.A parking scheme would have a dramatic impact on the conservation area due to the lines and signs required. Bristol attracts visitors because of its heritage so it needs to stay as it is.</p> <p>6.Unhappy at the increased financial burden involved in running the scheme.</p> <p>Requests that these comments be taken into account to counteract those made in objection 107.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p> <p>See response to objection 58 above.</p> <p>Lines and signs would be implemented as sympathetically as possible. The experience in Kingsdown has been that the reduction in the number of cars parked in the area has improved the conservation area.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed to be self-funding so does not represent an additional financial burden.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>118. Resident of 1-2 Oakfield Court Oakfield road BS8 2BD</p>	<p>Works in the area but lives some distance away. Car parks and public transport are too expensive, buses are unreliable, she is unable to cycle and walking would take too long.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>
<p>119. Resident of 6 Auburn Road Redland BS6 6LS</p>	<p>Objects as the scheme will have an extremely negative impact on people who live close to the perimeter. It includes Hampton Park but not adjoining roads. How can this be justified?</p> <p>Residents have not been informed or consulted with so their views are not being heard.</p> <p>It is already difficult to park in the area and the scheme will make this much worse.</p> <p>There is no justification for the boundary of the scheme to have been drawn in this way and no</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>

	statements have been made about the likely impact that the scheme will have on adjacent areas.	
120. Resident of 7 Huntley Grove Nailsea BS48 2UQ	Employed part-time by University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust. Needs to park within a reasonable distance of work so that her working hours fall within school hours.	See response to objection 64 above.
121. Resident of 24 Woodfield Road Redland BS7 6JQ	<p>Two previous referenda have been held about this and the answer to both was 'No'. To proceed is unacceptable.</p> <p>The Council is introducing a citywide scheme by salami slicing one area at a time.</p> <p>Lives in an overspill area and does not want the scheme there or in Cotham. It is authoritarian and anti democratic.</p> <p>Residents of the city have said that they do not want this scheme and the Council should listen to them.</p>	The non-statutory consultation regarding the initial proposals of the scheme found that residents are supportive of it. The Cabinet decided in July 2011 to develop proposals for residents' parking schemes in areas where the local community supported proposals.
122. Resident of Top Floor Flat 23 Ashgrove Road Redland BS6 6NA	<p>Cotham, Redland and Clifton are areas where residents, shops, businesses, shoppers and other visitors have to co-exist. This is a delicate business but works well.</p> <p>Residents' parking schemes will disturb this balance and damage businesses. They will make life more difficult and less pleasant and healthy by forcing people to drive to amenities outside the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The scheme is likely to be costly and will be complicated and confusing, which will make it ineffective to operate. It will change the character of the area and not for the better.</p>	<p>The scheme is intended to benefit residents and businesses in the area by making it easier for residents to park close to where they live and making businesses more accessible to customers. The experience of the scheme in Kingsdown is that this has been the case.</p> <p>The costs of the scheme have been kept to a minimum and there is no evidence that it has been confusing in Kingsdown. The experience of that scheme is that it has improved the character of the area.</p>

	<p>The answer is to provide a system of public transport that people want to use. In Bristol it is too slow, infrequent and unreliable.</p>	<p>The area is close to frequent bus and rail services. Cycling and walking may also be options for some journeys.</p>
<p>123. Resident of 9 Cotham Lawn Road BS6 6DU</p>	<p>1.Do not want the proposed double yellow lines outside their property. 2.Their neighbour at 8 Cotham Lawn Road does not want double yellow lines, although in his case there are no double yellow lines in existence at present and he wishes it to remain that way. 3.The existing parking space between 8 and 9 is to be removed and double yellow lines introduced. Requests that this does not happen. Cotham School being nearby already restricts the space available to residents and this makes it even more important that the current space is retained.</p>	<p>These requests can be accommodated and have been included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>124. Resident of 2 Kensington Road Redland BS6 6NL</p>	<p>The proposals will make the top of South Road and the Kensington Road junctions more dangerous to negotiate. Parking will be more congested and South Road in particular will be difficult to travel on and to cross. The junction is dangerous anyway and the proposals will have an additional negative impact.</p> <p>The Kingsdown scheme has caused Redland Grove to be solidly parked up all day. The Cotham scheme will move this problem into Kensington Road. The Kensington Public House area is already congested. This scheme will make it worse.</p> <p>Requests that the proposal be extended to include the remainder of Redland Grove, South Road and Kensington Road. This would increase the walking distance to the centre to the point that commuters would have to use alternative travel</p>	<p>Parking restrictions have recently been introduced at this junction, as part of the wider Cotham area scheme, which have improved visibility and protected the crossing points for pedestrians.</p> <p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>

	<p>means.</p> <p>Allowing 10 cars per house if the property is rented is ridiculous and unacceptable. If a building is so big that 10 permits are required, it should be subject to a separate application process.</p> <p>It is not fair that three cars in a private house cost more than three cars in a rented property.</p> <p>Lives in a one car household. Has no problem with permit parking but does have a problem with the slow process that the Council follows to introduce it. The rollout should be much quicker. Could the process be speeded up?</p>	<p>Each household will only be entitled to three residents' permits per annum. Landlords will be able to purchase one business permit for every ten properties that they own, up to a maximum of ten business permits.</p> <p>There is no difference between the cost of residents' permits for private houses and rented houses.</p>
<p>125. Resident of 22 Fenton Road Bishopston BS7 8ND</p>	<p>The proposals are unfair, as all motorists should have equal access to the roads.</p> <p>It is only being proposed because of the Kingsdown scheme. That scheme moved the problem to Cotham and this one will move it somewhere else.</p> <p>Bristol City Council should accept that the private car is the only transport system that works. If we had a modern transport system that provided the comfort, convenience and cheapness of the private car then there would not be a problem.</p> <p>This is a needless waste of money in a time of austerity and contravenes the Liberal Democrat policy of 'fairness' in government.</p>	<p>The proposals are intended to improve access to the area for residents, businesses and their visitors.</p> <p>It is being proposed because of the parking problems experienced by residents. Residents of adjacent areas will be consulted about the scheme once it has been implemented.</p> <p>Many improvements have been made to public transport in recent years and further improvements are planned.</p> <p>The scheme is designed to be self-funding and the Council considers that it is a fair solution to problems experienced by residents in Cotham.</p>
<p>126. Resident of Flat 4 80 Hampton Road BS6 6JB</p>	<p>The Council has spent taxpayers money on improving the bus service on Whiteladies Road and discouraging car users from trying to drive into the centre.</p>	<p>Improvements to public transport and effective demand management are part of the Council's transport policy as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.</p>

	<p>Phase 2 is starting with the extension of the residents' parking scheme.</p> <p>He will not want to use his car on a weekday now as all of the extra demand for space will mean that he will be unable to park on his return.</p> <p>Many residents of Hampton Road would like the scheme to cover all of Hampton Road and to go up to Lower Redland Road.</p>	See response to objection 58 above.
127. Resident of 7 Victoria Walk Cotham BS6 5SR	Requests that double yellow lines are not installed outside their garage, which opens onto Sydenham Hill opposite number 23. This will enable visitors to park there.	This request can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.
128. Resident of 89 Redland Road BS6 6RD	<p>Strongly objects to the scheme.</p> <p>It will deprive daytime visitors of parking space and will cause a problem for neighbouring areas. They live in an adjoining area and do not want the problem passed to them. They do not want the Council's solution to this of more residents' parking scheme areas.</p> <p>This is another stealth tax to provide bureaucrats with employment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See response to objection 58 above.</p> <p>The scheme is designed to benefit local residents and businesses in the area, not to generate revenue.</p>
129. Resident of 87 Redland Road BS6 6RD	<p>Strongly objects on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.It penalises the victims of the problem and not the culprits. 2.There is always a 'knock-on effect' from these schemes. 3.No provision has been made to deal with these 'knock-on effects'. 4.It does not address the needs of workers who come into the city. 5.Elderly people living alone and relying on 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The scheme provides a benefit to residents, who pay for this via the permit charge which has been kept to a minimum. 2.See response to objection 58 above. 3.See response to objection 58 above. 4.See response to objection 64 above. 5.Each household is eligible for 50 free visitors' permits per annum.

	<p>visits for company may not be able to afford them. The scheme is a tax on friendship. What sort of society will this create?</p> <p>Many of the residents' only bays in Kingsdown are only partially occupied. This deprives visitors of somewhere to park.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the parking capacity will not be fully utilised. This is necessary in order for people to find a parking space more easily than under the present arrangement.</p>
<p>130. Resident of 2 Seagry Close BS10 5NJ</p>	<p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.As a Bristol resident and council tax payer, he should not be restricted from parking. 2.Has sympathy for Cotham residents but feels that parking problems have been caused by the Kingsdown scheme. 3.Redland residents will be left with the fallout from this scheme. 4.Bristol City Council has a responsibility to all residents. What efforts have been made to offer alternatives to those who will no longer be able to park close to their place of work? 5.There is no proof that people parking lawfully in Cotham have caused any harm. The Council should be capable of dealing with obstruction at junctions and across driveways already. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The scheme prioritises parking for residents who live in the scheme area. 2.Parking problems have a variety of causes. 3.See response to objection 58 above. 4.See response to objection 64 above. 5. The scheme aims to prioritise parking for residents as well as to improve road safety in the area.
<p>131. Resident of 36 Monmouth Street Victoria Park BS3 4SJ</p>	<p>Works on Cotham Hill and relies on driving to work and parking in the local area. The scheme will make life more difficult. There is limited parking as it is. This scheme is unfair for workers and residents. The Council creates enough parking revenue to afford not to implement this scheme.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
<p>132. Resident of 11 Hampton Park BS6 6LG</p>	<p>Writing in support of objection 52.</p>	<p>See response to objection 52.</p>
<p>133. Work address of Films @ 59 59 Cotham Hill Clifton</p>	<p>Travels from Ilminster to work on Cotham Hill and has no choice but to drive. Paying for parking will add to travel costs, which are already expensive, and it will take longer to find a space.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>

BS6 6JR	Would like to know the reasons for the scheme being proposed.	
134. Resident of 4 Heather Avenue Frampton Cotterall BS36 2JR	This scheme could cost him his job and affect his well-being. It will make it impossible for him to drive to work due to varying shift patterns. Feels that this is not the only instance of the Council letting him down.	See response to objection 6 above.
135. Resident of 24 Elmgrove Road Redland BS6 6AJ	Wholeheartedly supports the scheme and looks forward to it being introduced as soon as possible.	Noted.
136. Resident of 20 Elmdale Road Tyndalls Park BS8 1SG	The online map shows a residents' parking area outside 25 Rokeby Avenue. Another plan shows double yellow lines there. 25 Rokeby Avenue has a paved driveway, so a double yellow line or residents' parking would not be suitable there. A residents' parking area outside 25 Rokeby Avenue (to the left of the main gate of number 25) where there is not a paved driveway would be very useful for the community.	The proposed arrangement reflects the current parking situation and affords protection to the off-street parking at number 23.
137. Resident of 12 Sydenham Road BS6 5SH	The scheme does not meet the needs of people working in the counselling / therapy rooms at 12 Sydenham Road. Staff would be restricted to pay & display parking but would only be able to offer two sessions during that time. A recent application for change of use to residential dwellings was resisted by the Council as it did not wish to lose counselling provision in the area. The counsellors / therapists are travelling from a	See response to objection 64 above.

	<p>variety of locations, often from another place of work. Some are essential car users as they are community mental health nurses.</p> <p>Has asked for counselling organisations to be allocated enough one day permits to cater for a minimum of two staff in the location at any one time. The charity has a policy of no lone working for health and safety reasons.</p>	
<p>138. Resident of 14 Archfield Road Cotham BS6 6BE</p>	<p>Queries issues that are not addressed in the draft order.</p> <p>Is there a limit to the number of permits that can be sold per street? There should be and the Council should know how many permits are likely to be applied for.</p> <p>If there is a limit will third permits only be issued once first and second permits have been allocated? This should be the case.</p> <p>How do they know that they can park in their street? This should be guaranteed.</p> <p>They have opted not to have double yellow lines in front of their garage. Who can park there? This should be clarified.</p> <p>Do the 50 visitors' permits last all day each?</p> <p>Can anyone with a tenancy agreement (they have a tenant) buy a £30 permit and have 50 guest passes?</p> <p>Will all students in an HMO be entitled to a permit and passes? If so, they oppose that proposal because students should be discouraged from</p>	<p>No; each household is eligible for up to three residents' permits per annum.</p> <p>The overall reduction in the number of vehicles permitted to park in the area will make it much easier for residents to park. Parking can never be guaranteed, as the number of visitors parked in the area at any one time will vary.</p> <p>This means that the area will be unrestricted, so any vehicle could park there.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Each household without off-street parking can buy up to three residents' permits per annum and is eligible for 50 free visitors' permits. This applies to the whole household, not each individual.</p> <p>Students sharing a house will be eligible for the same number of permits as other households.</p>

	<p>having cars. They often do not use them during the day and block spaces that could be used by permanent residents. We have been told at consultation meetings that only the landlord would be able to purchase permits and may not choose to do so.</p> <p>Our garage is too small for regular use and is dangerous to the public to exit from. Who assesses this and when? Who would we appeal to if we disagreed with any decision about a garage's suitability for use?</p> <p>Parking meters in Archfield Road are unnecessary as most residents rarely move their cars during the day so these spaces would not be available to the general public during the day. Meters would detract from the beauty of the road.</p>	<p>Properties designated as student halls of residence will not be eligible for permits. Landlords can purchase one business permit for every ten properties that they own, to facilitate checks and maintenance etc.</p> <p>A site visit would need to be carried out by a Council officer. Bristol City Council's decision about the number of permits that can be issued to a household is final.</p> <p>Pay & display parking offers residents more flexibility as it provides for visits. The beauty of the road will be improved by the scheme overall due to the reduction in parked cars and traffic flows.</p>
<p>139. Work address of Archfield House Nursery 2/4 Archfield Road BS6 6BE</p>	<p>Employs 41 staff at the nursery, which looks after 81 children. Requests that someone contact them to discuss how they manage the transition to the scheme.</p> <p>Accepts that parking is an issue but does not feel that this scheme is the solution, as it will only push the problem farther out.</p> <p>Own 2 and 4 Archfield Rd. Number 4 is let to tenants who use the off-street parking for their vehicles.</p> <p>They have no off-street parking for their business and do not want to create extra spaces as this will damage the feel of the area. The scheme will encourage people to turn their front gardens into driveways.</p>	<p>This has been noted and a meeting will be arranged before the scheme is introduced.</p> <p>See response to objection 58 above.</p> <p>It is anticipated that this will not apply to the majority of households, because permits are only needed from 9.00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday and the cost of purchasing permits is significantly cheaper than the cost of converting their garden into off-street parking.</p>

	<p>There are white zig zag markings across the driveway which are not enforceable and provide a safe place for dropping off and collecting children. The plans show these being removed and replaced with double yellow lines on either side of the drives. There are no marking between the drives which would allow a small vehicle to park there without a permit. Also concerned about deliveries. Requests that the white zig zag markings are left as they are including outside the garage on the other side of Pitch Lane leading to Cotham Grove.</p> <p>The 15 minutes free parking would be suitable for parents to use. Requests that they are issued with stickers that enable parents to park for up to 15 minutes so that they do not need to go to the machine to obtain a ticket.</p> <p>More concerned about the impact of the scheme on staff. Promotes sustainable transport and only 16 of the 41 members of staff drive to work. Of these 16, 2 vehicles regularly travel to and from their other nursery in Clifton. There is also a maintenance van which regularly uses the white zig zags. Concerned about where the van will park.</p> <p>Some staff may not be able to continue working there if parking is made more difficult. It would be easier for them to work at a nursery where parking is easier, which will have a serious impact on the business. Some staff do not finish work until 6.30pm and there is concern that this will create a safety issue due to staff having to walk further to reach their vehicle. They have already</p>	<p>Although the white zig-zag 'keep clear' marking has been used informally as a drop off area, the purpose of the marking is to keep that section of carriageway free of parking. Double yellow lines provide an enforceable restriction that renders the keep clear redundant. Set down and pick up can be accommodated by the 15 minutes of free parking provided in the shared use bays. Double yellow lines can be provided between the driveways to prevent obstructive parking. Double yellow lines do not prohibit the loading and unloading of vehicles.</p> <p>People using the 15 minutes free parking need to obtain a ticket from a pay & display machine showing the date and the expiry time of the ticket in order for the Council to enforce the scheme, so this will not be possible.</p> <p>The nursery would be eligible to apply for two business permits for operational vehicles. Each permit can carry two vehicle registration numbers, enabling it to be swapped between vehicles.</p> <p>See response to objection 64 above.</p> <p>The Council appreciates that staff are concerned about their safety after dark, but it is the Council's view that the introduction of this scheme will not increase safety issues,</p>
--	---	---

	<p>experienced one incident of a member of staff being inappropriately approached whilst returning to her car.</p> <p>Some of their issues could be resolved if they were entitled to more permits. Noted that garage businesses and landlords are offered more flexibility and would like clarification about this.</p> <p>Concerned at the lack of consultation as they were not notified of the proposals until signs went up on lampposts. Concerned that this scheme is not supported in the area and that it is an attempt by the Council to raise money.</p> <p>Has heard that parking meters have already been ordered and contractors appointed. This indicates that the decision has already been made. However, this is an appeal that their position as a nursery and community resource located in the area is considered sympathetically.</p> <p>It is essential that someone contacts them at the earliest opportunity.</p>	<p>particularly as the current parking arrangements mean that many people are regularly having to walk some distance to reach their vehicle.</p> <p>Landlords are offered one business permit for every ten properties that they own in the scheme area. Some businesses will be eligible for up to five customer permits, but these are not suitable for use by the same vehicle(s) every day.</p> <p>Every property within the scheme area was written to during the non-statutory consultation which took place in November 2011. This statutory consultation was notified in the local press and on the Council's website as well as on lampposts in the area.</p> <p>This is not the case. No pay & display machines have been ordered and no contractors have been appointed. This will not take place until a decision to implement the scheme has been made.</p> <p>This request has been noted and will be actioned.</p>
<p>140. Resident of 59 Hillesley Road GL12 8RU</p>	<p>Objects on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.It will make working in Bristol prohibitively expensive for people who require their car for their job or live in places without good transport links. 2.Public transport infrastructure is currently unsuitable for transporting all people from home to work. <p>1.Works as an IT engineer covering several NHS bases. There is not enough parking at the main base to enable engineers to do more</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>

	<p>than load or unload equipment. The NHS has secured a special discount with a car park that allows parking for £4 a day but this is still over £900 a year. Public transport costs £7 a day, which is too expensive.</p> <p>2.Lives in a rural area where the last bus from Bristol leaves just before 17.30. There are many places that are not well served by public transport.</p>	
<p>141. Resident of 6 New Fosseway Road BS14 9LN</p>	<p>The proposal is discrimination against working people.</p> <p>There is no option for most people as there is no suitable public transport in Bristol and what is available is too expensive. If this scheme must be introduced, this should not happen until the introduction of the rapid transit system. There used to be four bus services in his area. Now there is only one that runs hourly at the weekend and in the evening and half hourly during the day. It is impossible to work full time, take part in activities after work and take children to various activities using local bus services.</p> <p>Extending the existing restricted area will push the problem further. The Council should offer areas where people can park.</p> <p>Large parts of the area are not residential as the properties are let to students. Residents cannot be as stressed as is claimed. The stress levels of working people are high as it is very frustrating circulating in and out of streets trying to find a parking space.</p> <p>These schemes cause extra stress and wastes free time which should be used for relaxation.</p> <p>There may be NCP parking in the city centre but it is too expensive.</p> <p>The Council should not be putting all of the</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p> <p>See response to objection 58 above.</p> <p>The scheme aims to prioritise parking for all residents, whether they are students or workers.</p>

	<p>pressure onto working people just because residents are stressed by parking problems. Working people should be able to buy permits to park in the area and not students.</p>	
<p>142. Resident of 62 Kenmore Drive BS7 0TT</p>	<p>Strongly opposes these plans as a commuter. These restrictions should not be imposed on so many streets without providing alternative parking areas. Not everyone can cycle or walk and buses are too expensive.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>
<p>143. Work address of Cotham Antiques Cotham Hill BS6 6JZ</p>	<p>The existing limited waiting is working well and is supported by shops. Customers have said that they will not pay to park in the area. Additional costs should not be introduced when business is so poor. There have been three empty shops on Cotham Hill for months. The Council should consider this if it values small independent businesses.</p>	<p>Whilst the existing limited waiting provides turnover of parking spaces, it does not allow shoppers to stay for longer than one hour. The three hour parking provided by the pay & display bays will enable shoppers to stay in the area for longer, which should benefit local businesses. If people only want to visit one shop, they can use the 15 minutes free parking. The feedback from the Kingsdown scheme is that pay & display parking has been beneficial to small businesses as it enabled shoppers to access them more easily.</p>
<p>144. Resident of 14 Ravenswood Road Redland BS6 6BN</p>	<p>Supports the scheme in principle but objects to some of the detail, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South side of Ravenswood Rd outside number 14 – the ‘no waiting’ restriction in front of the dropped kerb was requested to be unrestricted in the previous consultation and this has been done for other residents. 2. South side of Ravenswood Rd outside number 14 – ‘no waiting’ restriction for remainder of frontage was previously requested to be a permit parking place. 3. Both sides of Ravenswood Rd at junction with Hampton Road – ‘no waiting’ restriction is too short. This is a very difficult junction and a greater length of ‘no waiting’ would reduce 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 This can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme. 2 Introducing a bay here would create a small bay that would be unsuitable for large cars. 3 Restrictions have been limited to one car length at this junction in order to maximise on-street parking spaces. This is considered adequate to in order to keep pedestrian crossing points clear and allow vehicles to pass each

	<p>accidents.</p> <p>4. North west side of Ravenswood Rd in front of number 47 to the Redland Grove junction – permit parking place would be better as shared use to allow drop off at the nursery.</p> <p>5. Both sides of Redland Grove – permit parking is shown along Cotham Gardens frontage and pay & display outside residential frontage. This should be reversed.</p> <p>6. South side of Waverley Road - parking shown from Woodstock Avenue to Montrose Avenue should be 'no waiting' as the road is narrow and the properties there have their frontage and access from adjoining roads.</p>	<p>other at the junctions. We will monitor the situation.</p> <p>4 This can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p> <p>5 Shared use bays will require a pay & display machine. The north eastern side of Redland Grove does not have a footway and is grass verge that forms part of Cotham Gardens. It would not be appropriate to place a machine in the verge and it would not be desirable to introduce footway at this location so that a machine can be introduced.</p> <p>6 It is agreed that this section of Waverley Road is narrow, however the proposals maintain a similar level of parking to that which currently occurs on this section of the road. This location will be monitored following the implementation and an adjustment proposed should this prove necessary.</p>
<p>145. Resident of 8 Stanley Road BS6 6NW</p>	<p>Objection on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. It is not consultation on a proposal; it is a statutory consultation which will be duly noted then dismissed.</p> <p>2. If the scheme is designed to manage commuter parking then it is unnecessary for it to operate from 9.00 to 5.00. It could be implemented for one hour a day, varying the times in different areas. This would stop commuter parking and have less impact on</p>	<p>1. Non-statutory consultation on initial proposals took place in November 2011. These proposals were refined before being subject to this statutory consultation. All objections will be considered before the decision is made.</p> <p>2. It is the Council's view that this would not be sufficient to reduce commuter parking, as people would move their vehicles during the day to avoid enforcement.</p>

	<p>residents.</p> <p>3.Objects to landlords being able to purchase 10 business permits at a cost of £100 each. The scheme is meant to improve lives for residents so why would non-resident landlords be able to have 10 permits? They would easily be able to sell them on.</p> <p>4.Hiring a skip is already expensive and paying an extra £52 a week is adding to this.</p> <p>How can it be guaranteed that the scheme will not be used to subsidise other transport schemes? How can we be certain that annual charges will only pay for the scheme and not be raised unnecessarily?</p>	<p>3.Landlords can purchase one business permit for every ten properties that they own, so only those landlords owning over 100 properties in the area would be able to purchase ten permits. Business permits carry vehicle registration numbers so could not be sold on.</p> <p>4.This charge reflects the cost of keeping the parking place clear for a week.</p> <p>The scheme is designed to be self-funding. Permit charges have been kept to a minimum.</p>
<p>146. Resident of 18 Penrose Drive Bradley Stoke BS32 8EN</p>	<p>Drives from Bradley Stoke as her children go to Bristol Grammar School and she works in Kingsdown. The scheme would mean that she would have to walk further each day to get to work on time after dropping her children off at school. The Council should look at the needs of workers as well as residents.</p> <p>What has the Council put in place for people that have to drive to work in the Cotham area? There are no park & ride facilities other than those at Parkway, which are too expensive. If everyone that parks in Cotham parks just outside the scheme area, this would only move the problem to that area. This is a moneymaking exercise by the Council.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above.</p>
<p>147. Resident of 11 Oakhurst road Bs9 3TQ</p>	<p>Works at Hampton House as a physiotherapist. Is required to travel between sites during the day. The lack of free parking would increase travel time and reduce the time spent treating patients.</p>	<p>Businesses can apply for two business permits for vehicles that are used for operational purposes during the day. Each permit can carry two vehicle registration numbers.</p>
<p>148. Resident of</p>	<p>Works at Hampton House as a physiotherapist.</p>	<p>See response to objection 64 above. The</p>

11 Downs Cote Drive Westbury on Trym BS9 3TP	The scheme will make parking for difficult for both workers and patients, many of whom have mobility difficulties.	scheme will make it easier for patients to park in the area by reducing the overall levels of parking.
149. Resident of 25 Archfield Road BS6 6BQ	About to complete on the purchase of 25 Archfield Road. Objects to protecting dropped kerbs with double yellow lines as this prevents property owners parking across their driveways.	This request can be accommodated and is included within the list of minor amendments to the scheme.
150. Resident of 4 Warren Lane Long Ashton BS41 9DA	Owns the Natural Health Clinic on Cotham Hill. The scheme will damage his business and the others in the area. Cotham Hill prides itself on its character of individual shops, cafes and businesses and the scheme will damage this. The clinic was not informed of or consulted about these proposals. This could have been a deliberate attempt to avoid the objections that would have been made.	See response to objection 143 above. Every property within the scheme area was written to during the non-statutory consultation which took place in November 2011. This statutory consultation was notified in the local press and on the Council's website as well as on lampposts in the area.
151. Resident of 24a Southfield Road BS6 6AY	Objects on the following grounds: 1.Pay & display. It is a narrow residential road where there have been a number of accidents involving cars driving to and from Southfield Road onto Cotham Brow. The road has a very steep incline. Introducing pay & display will increase traffic flow and is dangerous. The road provides vehicular access to parking for several blocks of flats so permit parking is likely to be oversubscribed. Traffic flows are already high. 2.Access. The proposals restrict access to the garage due to the car parking in front of the house and opposite. There is not sufficient room to exit or access the garage. 3.Safety. The road has a steep incline, so to	1.The bays on this section are shared use bays which are intended for use by residents as well as providing short stay parking for visitors to the street. Traffic flows may decrease as commuters will no longer be hunting for spaces on this street. 2 The proposed double yellow lines extend one metre beyond the top of the dropped kerbs. This will allow a vehicle to turn earlier, which should allow parking to occur opposite the garage with out impeding access. 3.As 2 above.

	<p>enter or exit the garage with a parking space directly in front of the house is very difficult. The space in front of 24a should not be allocated for parking as it will affect the line of sight when exiting the garage.</p> <p>4. Access to Southfield Road. There will be insufficient room to drive along the road if parking is permitted on both sides. This has only been possible if cars park on the pavement. Cars have often been moved or bumped, or vehicles have been prevented from driving along the road.</p>	<p>4. The anticipated reduction in commuter parking will provide more space on street, which should ease these sorts of access issues. This situation will be monitored and proposals to address this will be developed should the prove necessary as part of the intended six-month review.</p>
<p>152. Resident of 11 Cotham Road South Kingsdown BS6 5TZ</p>	<p>Is a partner at a firm of solicitors in the Kingsdown area, though close to the proposed Cotham area.</p> <p>They deal extensively with criminal defence work and frequently visit courts and police stations located around the city. They usually park on the street in Cotham during the day, so these proposals have serious consequences for them.</p> <p>Requests that the proposals for the Cotham scheme, and potentially the existing provision for the Kingsdown scheme, be amended as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the limit on the provision of business permits, with the permits being issued to businesses where the business can demonstrate that they are needed for business use rather than for commercial purposes. 2. Business permits to be transferable between members of staff within the same business. 3. Businesses be required to specify to the Council the details of all vehicles authorised to display the business permit. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of business permits that can be purchased was increased to two following the non-statutory consultation. 2. Each permit can be transferred between two named vehicles. 3. This has been considered but would be difficult and expensive to administer. The details of the vehicle need to be displayed on the permit.

	<p>These requests should be considered prior to any attempt to introduce a RPS in Cotham.</p> <p>The limited provision for parking for businesses located in the area is “Wednesbury unreasonable”.</p>	<p>Bristol City Council is acting reasonably in developing proposals that seek to balance the needs of competing highway users, that is, residents, businesses and visitors to the area. These proposals also form a key part of the Council’s general transport policies as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.</p>
<p>153. Resident of 92a Hampton Road BS6 6HW</p>	<p>Objects on the grounds that their stretch of road is not included within the proposed scheme area. The scheme would have an extremely negative impact on parking in all areas around the perimeter of the scheme.</p> <p>It is already very difficult to park in Hampton Road. Much of this is caused by people parking there and walking into the city centre. The loss of parking in the scheme area will cause even more people to do this in the streets outside the area.</p> <p>A ‘double-whammy’ effect will be created as people who live outside the proposed scheme area currently need to park within it sometimes and will not be able to if the scheme goes ahead.</p>	<p>See response to objection 112.</p>
<p>154. Resident of 17 Edgecumbe Road BS6 7AY</p>	<p>Lives just outside the boundary of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>The idea of this scheme has previously been rejected and is now being proposed as part of a creeping expansion of parking restrictions. The Council’s overall strategy has not been made available.</p>	<p>There was a positive response to the non-statutory consultation on the initial proposals for this area in November 2011. The Council’s wider transport strategy is set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.</p>

	<p>Addressing a 'problem' in one area will create the same problem elsewhere. People in Redland will have problems that do not exist at the moment because of this scheme.</p> <p>The scheme will require more signage, markings and general street clutter.</p> <p>Has not received any formal notification of these proposals. Surrounding roads will be affected so residents should be asked if they have any comments.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p> <p>The scheme will be implemented as sympathetically as possible.</p> <p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>155. Resident of 7 Thingwall Park Fishponds BS16 2AF</p>	<p>Works at the Natural Health Clinic on Cotham Hill. Has tried using the Severn Beach Line but it is often late which means that she is late for work, so it is not a viable alternative. If the scheme is introduced, she may not be able to continue working there.</p> <p>Many clients have long-term health problems that mean that they need to park close to the clinic.</p> <p>There are other practitioners who drive from the outskirts of the city who may be unable to continue working there.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
<p>156. Resident of 6a Cotham Lawn Road BS6 6DU</p>	<p>Objects on the grounds that there is no justification for permit parking.</p>	<p>The scheme is intended to make parking in the local area easier for residents, businesses and their visitors. A permit-based system is the most effective way of achieving this.</p>
<p>157. Resident of 46a Cotham Vale BS6 6HR</p>	<p>Owens the freehold of number 46 including the two garages. Requests that double yellow lines are not put outside the garages and that there is enough room left to turn into them.</p>	<p>This can be accommodated and has been included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme. Double yellow lines are proposed opposite the garages to protect dropped kerbs. These should also provide enough room to allow vehicles to turn into the garages.</p>
<p>158. Resident of 1 Courtside Mews Redland BS6 6PS</p>	<p>Residents of numbers 1-6 Courtside Mews have discussed and agreed the following requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the 'no parking' at the top of the Mews and create two permits only parking 	<p>The proposed design ensures a safe turning head at the end of Courtside Mews and allows for safe access and egress to and from Redland Grove. The scheme will be monitored during</p>

	<p>bays.</p> <p>2.Create a 'no parking' turning space by extending the double yellow lines alongside the pavement outside number 10.</p> <p>3.Add one permits only bay alongside the garden of number 1.</p> <p>4.Extend the double yellow lines for two car lengths along Redland Grove from the east corner of Courtside Mews as this is otherwise a blind turnout into Redland Grove and is dangerous with cars coming from fast from Cotham Grove, particularly given its proximity to the school.</p>	<p>the first six months of implementation and then reviewed. This would present an opportunity to modify the arrangement if necessary. We did not receive comments or objections from all of the residents of Courtside Mews.</p>
<p>159. Resident of 3 Courtside Mews BS6 6PS</p>	<p>Identical objection to number 158 above.</p>	<p>See response to objection 158 above.</p>
<p>160. Resident of 124 Redland Road BS6 6XY</p>	<p>There are no parking problems in this road. Because parking is not an issue, the only benefit of the scheme would be to make money for the Council.</p> <p>Objects to paying £50 to have visitors. Many professional people live in shared houses and will have to pay large sums of money for visitors. If there is a need for residents' parking then passes should be free.</p>	<p>Many local residents do experience parking problems. The scheme is intended to be self-funding and costs to residents have been kept to a minimum.</p> <p>Each household is eligible for 50 free visitors' permits per annum. A further 50 can be purchased at £1 per permit. Permits are only needed between 9.00am and 5.00pm Monday to Friday, so this may be sufficient for households of professionals.</p>
<p>161. Resident of 8 Ridgeway Parade</p>	<p>Works at Films @ 59 on Cotham Hill. Works a range of shifts from 8am-5pm to 5pm-2am. There</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>

Fishponds BS5 6RF	is no public transport at 2am and cannot afford to travel by taxi.	
162. Resident of 20 Clyde Road BS6 6RJ	Lives just outside the area. Parking is already difficult and this would make it impossible during university term-time. Very disappointed that they were not consulted.	See response to objection 58 above.
163. Resident of 3 Clyde Park BS6 6RS	Objects on the grounds that they will be affected but have not been consulted. Would like to see an extension of the scheme north of the railway line.	See response to objection 58 above.
164. Resident of 20 Clyde Road BS6 6RW	Lives just outside the area but was not consulted. Parking will be impossible. Only became aware of the proposals one day before consultation ended, which is not sufficient.	See response to objection 58 above.
165. Resident of 6a Cotham Lawn Road BS6 6DU	Has never had a problem finding a parking space. This proposal will only generate revenue for the Council.	Many local residents do experience parking problems. The scheme is intended to be self-funding and costs to residents have been kept to a minimum.
166. Resident of 98 Westover Road Westbury on Trym BS9 3LP	Works at St Michaels Hospital. The staff car park was turned into a patients car park so usually parks in residential streets nearby. If she had to park further away she would not be able to fit her working hours around the school run so may have to reduce her working hours. No consideration has been given to people who need to park within the area to work. Bus services are expensive and infrequent. Most houses have driveways and residents who do not were aware of the parking situation before they moved there.	See response to objection 64 above.
167. Resident of 9 Valma Rocks St George BS5 8SY	Is a self employed practitioner on Cotham Hill and has to carry equipment into the clinic each day. Clients rely on the ability to park near to the clinic.	See response to objection 6 above. The scheme will make it easier for patients to park in the area by reducing the overall levels of parking and increasing the number of places where they can

	<p>Parking is already difficult and this will make it worse. Will there be any free parking available or will all spaces be chargeable or for permit holders?</p>	<p>park for longer than one hour. There will be free parking for 15 minutes in the pay & display and shared use parking bays.</p>
<p>168. Resident of 59 Cotham Hill BS6 6JR</p>	<p>The scheme is a revenue raising exercise. As most residents work elsewhere and visitors cannot afford £1 an hour, there are now many areas with no cars at all.</p> <p>This will cause problems for businesses in terms of customer access, visitors, deliveries and footfall.</p>	<p>The scheme is intended to be self-funding, not to raise revenue.</p> <p>It is designed to make access to businesses easier; feedback from Kingsdown has demonstrated that this is achievable.</p>
<p>169. Resident of 6 Milner Road BS7 9PQ</p>	<p>Works at the Natural Health Clinic on Cotham Hill. Objects to the proposals on behalf of patients, many of whom need to park in close proximity to the clinic for their appointments.</p>	<p>See objection to 143 above.</p>
<p>170. Resident of 105 Gloucester Road Malmesbury Wiltshire SN16 0AJ</p>	<p>There is no provision for commuters coming in by car from outside Bristol. Works as a practitioner in a clinic on Cotham Hill. Clients are booked for hourly appointments and there is no time to move the car in between appointments.</p> <p>Public transport is not a viable option from Malmesbury.</p> <p>There is no need for the scheme to contain parts of Redland. The scheme creates parking restrictions, as there will be fewer parking spaces available. This will lead to more cars searching for spaces and would mean more lines and street furniture.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
<p>171. Work address of 59 Cotham Hill Clifton BS6 6JR</p>	<p>Works on Cotham Hill and usually walks there. Sometimes finishes work late at night when it is not a good idea to walk home.</p> <p>This scheme will make working life a lot more difficult for many people.</p>	<p>The scheme will operate from 9.00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday, so it will be possible to park in the area late at night without a permit.</p>

<p>172. Resident of 6a Cotham Lawn Road Cotham BS6 6DU</p>	<p>Has never had a problem parking. The scheme will increase the strain on local residents and any problems that have been identified will only be moved to another part of the city.</p>	<p>Many residents do experience problems parking. Feedback from residents in Kingsdown was that the scheme improved their quality of life and reduced the strain on them. Residents in areas adjacent to the scheme will be consulted after it has been implemented.</p>
<p>173. Resident of 9 Elgin Park Redland BS6 6RU</p>	<p>Supports the new restrictions in Redland as they will tackle selfish and dangerous parking.</p> <p>Very concerned about the impact that this scheme will have on Elgin Park. Would like residents' parking in this road and would be prepared to pay more for a permit if necessary.</p> <p>If a full residents' parking scheme cannot be introduced here, parking should be banned from 7.00 to 9.30am on weekdays which would stop people leaving their cars there and going to the city centre to work.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See response to objection 58 above.</p> <p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>174. Resident of 39 Cotham Hill BS6 6JY</p>	<p>Works at the Natural Health Clinic on Cotham Hill. Their clients need to be able to park close to the clinic as they are often unwell but do not have a disabled parking badge, for example if they are suffering from a bad back or sports injury. Pay & display will add a significant extra cost to their treatment. There is a reduction in parking opportunities due to some of the spaces being reserved for residents.</p> <p>Would it be possible to amend the parking on Abbotsford Road so that all of it is shared use?</p>	<p>See response to objection 143 above.</p> <p>The balance between the needs of residents and those of businesses in the vicinity of Cotham Hill area has been looked at carefully in part of the original consultation. The current design represents a good compromise in balancing these needs.</p>
<p>175. Resident of 30 Abbotsford Road</p>	<p>The dropped kerbs are not mapped correctly on the plans. There is room for a space between 30</p>	<p>Bay created would be less than four metres in length. A large car would not be able to park at</p>

<p>Redland BS6 6HB</p>	<p>and 32.</p> <p>Does not want double yellow lines across the driveway at number 30.</p>	<p>this location without overhanging the bay.</p> <p>This request can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>176. Resident of 20 Clyde Park BS6 6RW</p>	<p>Lives close to the scheme and has not been consulted even though it will have a serious impact on her. This is a serious disregard for the rights of residents in this road. Residents who live in the scheme area will park their vehicles just outside it, as will the displaced commuters. The scheme should be abandoned.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>
<p>177. Resident of 9 Valma Rocks St George BS5 8SY</p>	<p>Duplicate of objection 167.</p>	<p>See response to objection 167 above.</p>
<p>178. Resident of 106 Waterhouse Lane Chelmsford Essex CM1 2QU</p>	<p>Currently working outside Bristol, but her main residence is at 3 Cotham Place. Concerned at the lack of consultation.</p> <p>Parking meters are inappropriate for a residential area, particularly with the proposed charges and time periods. 15 minutes is not sufficient time to make a social visit.</p> <p>Has not had the opportunity to study plans for Cotham Place. Does not want any form of restricted parking outside her garage.</p>	<p>Letters were sent to every property in the proposed scheme area to notify residents and businesses about the informal consultation, which took place in November.</p> <p>Most of the available parking has been prioritised for residents and their visitors. Each household is eligible for 50 free visitors' permits per annum, with each permit lasting one day. A further 50 permits can be purchased at a cost of £1 per permit.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines can be remove; this has been included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>179. Resident of 2 Clyde Park Bs6 6RR</p>	<p>Chairman of the Clyde Park Residents Association.</p> <p>Students living within the area who do not have permits will park north of the railway line all week, as will commuters who currently park in the scheme area.</p>	<p>See response to objection 58 above.</p>

	<p>Most members would support an extension of the scheme into their area.</p> <p>A failure to consider objections from neighbouring areas may well mean that there will be a legal challenge in the future.</p>	
<p>180. Resident of 39 Cotham Hill BS6 6JY</p>	<p>Works at the Natural Health Clinic on Cotham Hill. Staff and patients travel from a variety of locations and need to be able to park there.</p> <p>Insufficient time has been given for consultation with the public.</p> <p>The Council should consider the effect that the proposal will have on local businesses and on trade in the area.</p>	<p>See response to objection 167 above.</p> <p>The initial proposals were consulted on for five weeks in 2011. These final proposals have been advertised for 24 days, which is longer than the statutory requirement of 21 days. The Council considers that the scheme will improve access to local shops and businesses.</p>
<p>181. Resident of 39 Cotham Hill BS6 6JY</p>	<p>Works at the Natural Health Clinic on Cotham Hill. This scheme will mean that many practitioners will be unable to park nearby. The scheme will cause even bigger problems for their patients, many of whom have physical impairments but may not have a disabled badge. The scheme would lead to pay & display bays being blocked for three hours.</p> <p>They are seeking to improve disabled access to the clinic by creating a new entrance, as many patients cannot use the steps. They would be applying for a disabled bay at that time. Could they have a specially designated bay for their patients rather than a statutory disabled bay?</p>	<p>See response to objection 167 above.</p> <p>It is not possible to provide designated parking bays for the sole use of a business.</p>
<p>182. Resident of 28 Elmgrove Road Redland BS6 6AJ</p>	<p>Strongly objects to having double yellow lines outside the property.</p>	<p>This request can be accommodated and is included in the list of minor amendments to the scheme.</p>
<p>183. Resident of</p>	<p>Works on Cotham Hill and has no available public</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>

<p>The Old Post House Mark Highbridge Somerset TA9 4LY</p>	<p>transport. Does not know how he will get to work.</p>	
<p>184. Resident of 4 Latton Road Horfield BS7 0UX</p>	<p>Objects as it will be impossible to park close to the University, which is one of the largest employers in the city.</p> <p>It will also encourage residents to convert front gardens to off-street parking.</p>	<p>Pay & display parking can be used by people visiting the University for up to three hours.</p> <p>Article 4 requires that a planning application be submitted in order to do this where the effects on the character of the area would be considered. The cost of converting a front garden would far outweigh the cost of a residents' permit.</p>
<p>185. Resident of 42 Thingwall Park BS16 2AE</p>	<p>Works at the Natural Health Clinic. Has tried travelling by bicycle, bus and train but these are not suitable alternatives to the private car. This scheme would make the car far too expensive and would also cause difficulties for patients.</p>	<p>See response to objection 6 above.</p>
<p>186. Resident of 7 Dams Way Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 56H</p>	<p>Owns a house in Waverley Road. Understands that the parking problems in Cotham need resolving but is concerned that it may not be possible for them to have a permit to enable them to park close by.</p> <p>Concerned at the cost of £100 to enable tradesmen to visit and about the needs of people working in the area.</p>	<p>Owners of properties in the scheme area can purchase a business permit at a cost of £100 per annum. Alternatively, the pay & display parking could be used for visits of up to three hours.</p> <p>Tradesmen could use the pay & display parking if they do not have a visitors' permit. The scheme is designed to prioritise parking in the area for residents, businesses and their visitors.</p>
<p>187. Resident of 38 Longfield Road BS7 9AG</p>	<p>Owner of a property on Archfield Road. Has never had difficulty parking. Strongly objects on the grounds that the scheme is a money-making exercise that will be of little benefit.</p>	<p>Many residents in the area do have parking problems. The scheme is not intended to make money and the charges associated with it have been kept to a minimum.</p>
<p>188. Resident of 5 Courtside Mews</p>	<p>Has discussed the scheme with the other residents of 1-6 Courtside Mews.</p>	<p>See response to objection 158 above.</p>

Redland
BS6 6PS

Requests amendments to the design of the
scheme, as set out in objection 158.

Appendix 2

Minor amendments to Cotham Residents' Parking Scheme proposals

Location	Amendment
30 Abbotsford Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
32 Abbotsford Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
25 Archfield Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
27 Archfield Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
27 and 29 Archfield Road	Introduce additional permit holders' only parking place between driveways
29 Archfield Road	Remove double yellow lines across access
38 Archfield Road	Remove proposed mandatory disabled bay and replace with permit holders' only parking
52 Archfield Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
54 Archfield Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
56 and 58 Archfield Road	Introduce additional permit holders' only parking place between driveways
58 Archfield Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
1 Cotham Park	Shorten proposed mandatory disabled bay and replace with permit holders' only parking
8a – 9 Cotham Lawn Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveways of numbers 8a and 9 and from the gap between their driveways.
3 Cotham Place	Remove double yellow lines outside garage
46 Cotham Vale	Remove double yellow lines outside the two garages
Eastfield Road	Create an additional parking space
1 Eastfield Road	Remove proposed mandatory disabled bay and replace with shared use parking
10 Elmgrove Road	Remove proposed mandatory disabled bay and replace with permit holders' only parking
33 Hampton Road	Remove proposed mandatory disabled bay and replace with shared use parking
35/37 Hampton Park	Remove double yellow lines outside gate
14 Ravenswood Road	Remove double yellow lines across dropped kerb
33 Ravenswood Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
47 Ravenswood Road	Convert permit holders' only parking place to shared use
48 Ravenswood Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
59A Ravenswood Road	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
2 Rokeby Avenue	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
11 Rokeby Avenue	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
24 Rokeby Avenue	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
24 Sydenham Road	Remove double yellow lines from the front of their garages
Sydenham Hill	Remove double yellow lines from outside the garage belonging to 7 Victoria Walk, which opens onto Sydenham Hill opposite number 23.

30-32 Waverley Road	Adjust location of permit holders' only bay and double yellow lines to better reflect the location of the driveway
14 Woodstock Avenue	Remove proposed mandatory disabled bay and replace with permit holders' only parking
26 Woodstock Avenue	Remove double yellow lines across driveway
N/A	Amend order to enable businesses other than garages / car repair workshops to apply for customer permits.